



Appendix A

DUPLICATED REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE

BUREAU OF DESIGN AND ENVIRONMENT MANUAL

APPENDIX A

DUPLICATED REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE

Appendix A duplicates the following selected environmental regulations and guidance which have gained national prominence:

- the *CEQ Regulations*,
- 23 CFR 771 *Environmental Impact and Related Procedures*,
- FHWA Technical Advisory T6640.8A *Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents*,
- CEQ Questions and Answers (“40 Questions”),
- 4(f) Policy Questions and Answers, and
- Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluations.

CHAPTER V — COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

<i>Part</i>		<i>Page</i>
1500	Purpose, policy, and mandate	1
1501	NEPA and agency planning	3
1502	Environmental impact statement	7
1503	Commenting	14
1504	Predecision referrals to the Council of proposed Federal actions determined to be environmentally unsatisfactory	16
1505	NEPA and agency decisionmaking	18
1506	Other requirements of NEPA	19
1507	Agency compliance	24
1508	Terminology and index	26

PART 1500 — PURPOSE, POLICY, AND MANDATE

Sec.

- 1500.1 Purpose.
- 1500.2 Policy.
- 1500.3 Mandate.
- 1500.4 Reducing paperwork.
- 1500.5 Reducing delay.
- 1500.6 Agency authority.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609) and E.O. 11514, Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55990, Nov. 28, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1500.1 Purpose.

(a) The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is our basic national charter for protection of the environment. It establishes policy, sets goals (section 101), and provides means (section 102) for carrying out the policy. Section 102(2) contains “action-forcing” provisions to make sure that federal agencies act according to the letter and spirit of the Act. The regulations that follow implement section 102(2). Their purpose is to tell federal agencies what they must do to comply with the procedures and achieve the goals of the Act. The President, the federal agencies, and the courts share responsibility for enforcing the Act so as to achieve the substantive requirements of section 101.

(b) NEPA procedures must insure that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken. The information must be of high quality. Accurate scientific analysis, expert agency comments, and public scrutiny are essential to implementing NEPA. Most important, NEPA documents must concentrate on the issues that are truly significant to the action in question, rather than amassing needless detail.

(c) Ultimately, of course, it is not better documents but better decisions that count.

NEPA's purpose is not to generate paperwork—even excellent paperwork—but to foster excellent action. The NEPA process is intended to help public officials make decisions that are based on understanding of environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment. These regulations provide the direction to achieve this purpose.

§ 1500.2 Policy.

Federal agencies shall to the fullest extent possible:

(a) Interpret and administer the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States in accordance with the policies set forth in the Act and in these regulations.

(b) Implement procedures to make the NEPA process more useful to decisionmakers and the public; to reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data; and to emphasize real environmental issues and alternatives. Environmental impact statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that agencies have made the necessary environmental analyses.

(c) Integrate the requirements of NEPA with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law or by agency practice so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively.

(d) Encourage and facilitate public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment.

(e) Use the NEPA process to identify and assess the reasonable alternatives to proposed actions that will avoid or minimize adverse effects of these actions upon the quality of the human environment.

(f) Use all practicable means, consistent with the requirements of the Act and other essential considerations of national policy, to restore and enhance the quality of the human environment and avoid or minimize any possible adverse affects of their actions upon the quality of the human environment.

§ 1500.3 Mandate.

Parts 1500 through 1508 of this title provide regulations applicable to and binding on all Federal agencies for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (Pub. L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. 4321 et. seq.) (NEPA or the Act) except where compliance would be inconsistent with other statutory requirements. These regulations are issued pursuant to NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.) section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609) and Executive Order 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality (March 5, 1970, as amended by Executive Order 11991, May 24, 1977). These regulations, unlike the predecessor guidelines, are not confined to sec. 102(2)(C) (environmental impact statements). The regulations apply to the whole of section 102(2). The provisions of the Act and of these regulations must be read together as a whole in order to comply with the spirit and letter of the law. It is the Council's intention that judicial review of agency compliance with these regulations not occur before an agency has filed the final environmental impact statement, or has made a final finding of no significant impact (when such a finding will result in action affecting the environment), or takes action that will result in irreparable injury. Furthermore, it is the Council's intention that any trivial violation of these regulations not give rise to any independent cause of action.

§ 1500.4 Reducing paperwork.

Agencies shall reduce excessive paperwork by:

- (a) Reducing the length of environmental impact statements (§ 1502.2(c)), by means such as setting appropriate page limits (§§ 1501.7(b)(1) and 1502.7).
- (b) Preparing analytic rather than encyclopedic environmental impact statements (§ 1502.2(a)).
- (c) Discussing only briefly issues other than significant ones (§ 1502.2(b)).

- (d) Writing environmental impact statements in plain language (§ 1502.8).

- (e) Following a clear format for environmental impact statements (§ 1502.10).

- (f) Emphasizing the portions of the environmental impact statement that are useful to decisionmakers and the public (§§ 1502.14 and 1502.15) and reducing emphasis on background material (§ 1502.16).

- (g) Using the scoping process, not only to identify significant environmental issues deserving of study, but also to de-emphasize insignificant issues, narrowing the scope of the environmental impact statement process accordingly (§ 1501.7).

- (h) Summarizing the environmental impact statement (§ 1502.12) and circulating the summary instead of the entire environmental impact statement if the latter is unusually long (§ 1502.19).

- (i) Using program, policy, or plan environmental impact statements and tiering from statements of broad scope to those of narrower scope, to eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues (§§ 1502.4 and 1502.20).

- (j) Incorporating by reference (§ 1502.21).

- (k) Integrating NEPA requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements (§ 1502.25).

- (l) Requiring comments to be as specific as possible (§ 1503.3).

- (m) Attaching and circulating only changes to the draft environmental impact statement, rather than rewriting and circulating the entire statement when changes are minor (§ 1503.4(c)).

- (n) Eliminating duplication with State and local procedures, by providing for joint preparation (§ 1506.2), and with other Federal procedures, by providing that an agency may adopt appropriate environmental documents prepared by another agency (§ 1506.3).

- (o) Combining environmental documents with other documents (§ 1506.4).

- (p) Using categorical exclusions to define categories of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the

human environment and which are therefore exempt from requirements to prepare an environmental impact statement (§ 1508.4).

(q) Using a finding of no significant impact when an action not otherwise excluded will not have a significant effect on the human environment and is therefore exempt from requirements to prepare an environmental impact statement (§ 1508.13).

[43 FR 55990, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan 3, 1979]

§ 1500.5 Reducing delay.

Agencies shall reduce delay by:

(a) Integrating the NEPA process into early planning (§ 1501.2).

(b) Emphasizing interagency cooperation before the environmental impact statement is prepared, rather than submission of adversary comments on a completed document (§ 1501.6).

(c) Insuring the swift and fair resolution of lead agency disputes (§ 1501.5).

(d) Using the scoping process for an early identification of what are and what are not the real issues (§ 1501.7).

(e) Establishing appropriate time limits for the environmental impact statement process (§§ 1501.7(b)(2) and 1501.8).

(f) Preparing environmental impact statements early in the process (§ 1502.5).

(g) Integrating NEPA requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements (§ 1502.25).

(h) Eliminating duplication with State and local procedures by providing for joint preparation (§ 1506.2) and with other Federal procedures by providing that an agency may adopt appropriate environmental documents prepared by another agency (§ 1506.3).

(i) Combining environmental documents with other documents (§ 1506.4).

(j) Using accelerated procedures for proposals for legislation (§ 1506.8).

(k) Using categorical exclusions to define categories of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment (§ 1508.4) and which are therefore exempt from requirements to prepare an environmental impact statement.

(l) Using a finding of no significant impact when an action not otherwise excluded will not have a significant effect on the human environment (§ 1508.13) and is therefore exempt from requirements to prepare an environmental impact statement.

§ 1500.6 Agency authority.

Each agency shall interpret the provisions of the Act as a supplement to its existing authority and as a mandate to view traditional policies and missions in the light of the Act's national environmental objectives. Agencies shall review their policies, procedures, and regulations accordingly and revise them as necessary to insure full compliance with the purposes and provisions of the Act. The phrase "to the fullest extent possible" in section 102 means that each agency of the Federal Government shall comply with that section unless existing law applicable to the agency's operations expressly prohibits or makes compliance impossible.

PART 1501 — NEPA AND AGENCY PLANNING

Sec.	Purpose
1501.1	Purpose
1501.2	Apply NEPA early in the process.
1501.3	When to prepare an environmental assessment
1501.4	Whether to prepare an environmental impact statement.
1501.5	Lead agencies.
1501.6	Cooperating agencies.
1501.7	Scoping.
1501.8	Time limits.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609, and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55992, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1501.1 Purpose.

The purposes of this part include:

(a) Integrating the NEPA process into early planning to insure appropriate consideration of NEPA's policies and to eliminate delay.

(b) Emphasizing cooperative consultation among agencies before the environmental impact statement is prepared rather than submission of adversary comments on a completed document.

(c) Providing for the swift and fair resolution of lead agency disputes.

(d) Identifying at any early stage the significant environmental issues deserving of study and de-emphasizing insignificant issues, narrowing the scope of the environmental impact statement accordingly.

(e) Providing a mechanism for putting appropriate time limits on the environmental impact statement process.

§ 1501.2 Apply NEPA early in the process.

Agencies shall integrate the NEPA process with other planning at the earliest possible time to insure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values, to avoid delays later in the process, and to head off potential conflicts. Each agency shall:

(a) Comply with the mandate of section 102(2)(A) to "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment," as specified by § 1507.2.

(b) Identify environmental effects and values in adequate detail so they can be compared to economic and technical analyses. Environmental documents and appropriate analyses shall be circulated and reviewed at the same time as other planning documents.

(c) Study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources as provided by section 102(2)(E) of the Act.

(d) Provide for cases where actions are planned by private applicants or other non-

Federal entities before Federal involvement so that:

(1) Policies or designated staff are available to advise potential applicants of studies or other information foreseeably required for later Federal action.

(2) The Federal agency consults early with appropriate State and local agencies and Indian tribes and with interested private persons and organizations when its own involvement is reasonably foreseeable.

(3) The Federal agency commences its NEPA process at the earliest possible time.

§ 1501.3 When to prepare an environmental assessment.

(a) Agencies shall prepare an environmental assessment (§ 1508.9) when necessary under the procedures adopted by individual agencies to supplement these regulations as described in § 1507.3. An assessment is not necessary if the agency has decided to prepare an environmental impact statement.

(b) Agencies may prepare an environmental assessment on any action at any time in order to assist agency planning and decisionmaking.

§ 1501.4 Whether to prepare an environmental impact statement.

In determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement the Federal agency shall:

(a) Determine under its procedures supplementing these regulations (described in § 1507.3) whether the proposal is one which:

(1) Normally requires an environmental impact statement, or

(2) Normally does not require either an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment (categorical exclusion).

(b) If the proposed action is not covered by paragraph (a) of this section, prepare an environmental assessment (§ 1508.9). The agency shall involve environmental agencies, applicants, and the public, to the extent practicable, in preparing assessments required by § 1508.9(a)(1).

(c) Based on the environmental assessment make its determination whether to prepare an environmental impact statement.

(d) Commence the scoping process (§ 1501.7), if the agency will prepare an environmental impact statement.

(e) Prepare a finding of no significant impact (§ 1508.13), if the agency determines on the basis of the environmental assessment not to prepare a statement.

(1) The agency shall make the finding of no significant impact available to the affected public as specified in § 1506.6.

(2) In certain limited circumstances, which the agency may cover in its procedures under § 1507.3, the agency shall make the finding of no significant impact available for public review (including State and areawide clearinghouses) for 30 days before the agency makes its final determination whether to prepare an environmental impact statement and before the action may begin. The circumstances are:

(i) The proposed action is, or is closely similar to, one which normally requires the preparation of an environmental impact statement under the procedures adopted by the agency pursuant to § 1507.3, or

(ii) The nature of the proposed action is one without precedent.

§ 1501.5 Lead agencies.

(a) A lead agency shall supervise the preparation of an environmental impact statement if more than one Federal agency either:

(1) Proposes or is involved in the same action; or

(2) Is involved in a group of actions directly related to each other because of their functional interdependence or geographical proximity.

(b) Federal, State, or local agencies, including at least one Federal agency, may act as joint lead agencies to prepare an environmental impact statement (§ 1506.2).

(c) If an action falls within the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section the potential lead agencies shall determine by letter or memorandum which agency shall be the lead agency and which shall be cooperating agencies. The agencies shall resolve the lead agency

question so as not to cause delay. If there is disagreement among the agencies, the following factors (which are listed in order of descending importance) shall determine lead agency designation:

(1) Magnitude of agency's involvement.

(2) Project approval/disapproval authority.

(3) Expertise concerning the action's environmental effects.

(4) Duration of agency's involvement.

(5) Sequence of agency's involvement.

(d) Any Federal agency, or any State or local agency or private person substantially affected by the absence of lead agency designation, may make a written request to the potential lead agencies that a lead agency be designated.

(e) If Federal agencies are unable to agree on which agency will be the lead agency or if the procedure described in paragraph (c) of this section has not resulted within 45 days in a lead agency designation, any of the agencies or persons concerned may file a request with the Council asking it to determine which Federal agency shall be the lead agency.

A copy of the request shall be transmitted to each potential lead agency. The request shall consist of:

(1) A precise description of the nature and extent of the proposed action.

(2) A detailed statement of why each potential lead agency should or should not be the lead agency under the criteria specified in paragraph (c) of this section.

(f) A response may be filed by any potential lead agency concerned within 20 days after a request is filed with the Council. The Council shall determine as soon as possible but not later than 20 days after receiving the request and all responses to it which Federal agency shall be the lead agency and which other Federal agencies shall be cooperating agencies.

[43 FR 55992, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan 3. 1979]

§ 1501.6 Cooperating agencies.

The purpose of this section is to emphasize agency cooperation early in the NEPA process. Upon request of the lead agency, any other Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law

shall be a cooperating agency. In addition any other Federal agency which has special expertise with respect to any environmental issue, which should be addressed in the statement may be a cooperating agency upon request of the lead agency. An agency may request the lead agency to designate it a cooperating agency.

(a) The lead agency shall:

(1) Request the participation of each cooperating agency in the NEPA process at the earliest possible time.

(2) Use the environmental analysis and proposals of cooperating agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise, to the maximum extent possible consistent with its responsibility as lead agency.

(3) Meet with a cooperating agency at the latter's request.

(b) Each cooperating agency shall:

(1) Participate in the NEPA process at the earliest possible time.

(2) Participate in the scoping process (described below in § 1501.7).

(3) Assume on request of the lead agency responsibility for developing information and preparing environmental analyses including portions of the environmental impact statement concerning which the cooperating agency has special expertise.

(4) Make available staff support at the lead agency's request to enhance the latter's interdisciplinary capability.

(5) Normally use its own funds. The lead agency shall, to the extent available funds permit, fund those major activities or analyses it requests from cooperating agencies. Potential lead agencies shall include such funding requirements in their budget requests.

(c) A cooperating agency may in response to a lead agency's request for assistance in preparing the environmental impact statement (described in paragraph (b)(3), (4), or (5) of this section) reply that other program commitments preclude any involvement or the degree of involvement requested in the action that is the subject of the environmental impact statement. A copy of this reply shall be submitted to the Council.

§ 1501.7 Scoping.

There shall be an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. This process shall be termed scoping. As soon as practicable after its decision to prepare an environmental impact statement and before the scoping process the lead agency shall publish a notice of intent (§ 1508.22) in the FEDERAL REGISTER except as provided in § 1507.3(e).

(a) As part of the scoping process the lead agency shall:

(1) Invite the participation of affected Federal, State, and local agencies, any affected Indian tribe, the proponent of the action, and other interested persons (including those who might not be in accord with the action on environmental grounds), unless there is a limited exception under § 1507.3(c). An agency may give notice in accordance with § 1506.6.

(2) Determine the scope (§ 1508.25) and the significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the environmental impact statement.

(3) Identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review (§ 1506.3), narrowing the discussion of these issues in the statement to a brief presentation of why they will not have a significant effect on the human environment or providing a reference to their coverage elsewhere.

(4) Allocate assignments for preparation of the environmental impact statement among the lead and cooperating agencies, with the lead agency retaining responsibility for the statement.

(5) Indicate any public environmental assessments and other environmental impact statements which are being or will be prepared that are related to but are not part of the scope of the impact statement under consideration.

(6) Identify other environmental review and consultation requirements so the lead and cooperating agencies may prepare other required analyses and studies concurrently with, and integrated with, the environmental impact statement as provided in § 1502.25.

(7) Indicate the relationship between the timing of the preparation of environmental analyses and the agency's tentative planning and decisionmaking schedule.

(b) As part of the scoping process the lead agency may:

(1) Set page limits on environmental documents (§ 1502.7).

(2) Set time limits (§ 1501.8).

(3) Adopt procedures under § 1507.3 to combine its environmental assessment process with its scoping process.

(4) Hold an early scoping meeting or meetings which may be integrated with any other early planning meeting the agency has. Such a scoping meeting will often be appropriate when the impacts of a particular action are confined to specific sites.

(c) An agency shall revise the determinations made under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section if substantial changes are made later in the proposed action, or if significant new circumstances or information arise which bear on the proposal or its impacts.

§ 1501.8 Time limits.

Although the Council has decided that prescribed universal time limits for the entire NEPA process are too inflexible, Federal agencies are encouraged to set time limits appropriate to individual actions (consistent with the time intervals required by § 1506.10). When multiple agencies are involved the reference to agency below means lead agency.

(a) The agency shall set time limits if an applicant for the proposed action requests them: *Provided*, That the limits are consistent with the purposes of NEPA and other essential considerations of national policy.

(b) The agency may:

(1) Consider the following factors in determining time limits:

(i) Potential for environmental harm.

(ii) Size of the proposed action.

(iii) State of the art of analytic techniques.

(iv) Degree of public need for the proposed action, including the consequences of delay.

(v) Number of persons and agencies affected.

(vi) Degree to which relevant information is known and if not known the time required for obtaining it.

(vii) Degree to which the action is controversial.

(viii) Other time limits imposed on the agency by law, regulations, or executive order.

(2) Set overall time limits or limits for each constituent part of the NEPA process, which may include:

(i) Decision on whether to prepare an environmental impact statement (if not already decided).

(ii) Determination of the scope of the environmental impact statement.

(iii) Preparation of the draft environmental impact statement.

(iv) Review of any comments on the draft environmental impact statement from the public and agencies.

(v) Preparation of the final environmental impact statement.

(vi) Review of any comments on the final environmental impact statement.

(vii) Decision on the action based in part on the environmental impact statement.

(3) Designate a person (such as the project manager or a person in the agency's office with NEPA responsibilities) to expedite the NEPA process.

(c) State or local agencies or members of the public may request a Federal Agency to set time limits.

PART 1502 — ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Sec.

1502.1 Purpose

1502.2 Implementation.

1502.3 Statutory requirements for statements.

1502.4 Major Federal actions requiring the preparation of environmental impact statements.

1502.5 Timing.

1502.6 Interdisciplinary preparation.

1502.7 Page limits.

1502.8 Writing.

1502.9 Draft, final, and supplemental statements.

1502.10 Recommended format.

1502.11 Cover sheet.

1502.12 Summary.

- 1502.13 Purpose and need.
- 1502.14 Alternatives including the proposed action.
- 1502.15 Affected environment.
- 1502.16 Environmental consequences.
- 1502.17 List of preparers.
- 1502.18 Appendix.
- 1502.19 Circulation of the environmental impact statement.
- 1502.20 Tiering.
- 1502.21 Incorporation by reference.
- 1502.22 Incomplete or unavailable information.
- 1502.23 Cost-benefit analysis.
- 1502.24 Methodology and scientific accuracy.
- 1502.25 Environmental review and consultation requirements.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55994, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1502.1 Purpose.

The primary purpose of an environmental impact statement is to serve as an action-forcing device to insure that the policies and goals defined in the Act are infused into the ongoing programs and actions of the Federal Government. It shall provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decisionmakers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. Agencies shall focus on significant environmental issues and alternatives and shall reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data. Statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that the agency has made the necessary environmental analyses. An environmental impact statement is more than a disclosure document. It shall be used by Federal officials in conjunct with other relevant material to plan actions and make decisions.

§ 1502.2 Implementation.

To achieve the purposes set forth in § 1502.1 agencies shall prepare environmental impact statements in the following manner:

(a) Environmental impact statements shall be analytic rather than encyclopedic.

(b) Impacts shall be discussed in proportion to their significance. There shall be only brief discussion of other than significant issues. As in a finding of no significant impact, there should be only enough discussion to show why more study is not warranted.

(c) Environmental impact statements shall be kept concise and shall be no longer than absolutely necessary to comply with NEPA and with these regulations. Length should vary first with potential environmental problems and then with project size.

(d) Environmental impact statements shall state how alternatives considered in it and decisions based on it will or will not achieve the requirements of sections 101 and 102(1) of the Act and other environmental laws and policies.

(e) The range of alternatives discussed in environmental impact statements shall encompass those to be considered by the ultimate agency decisionmaker.

(f) Agencies shall not commit resources prejudicing selection of alternatives before making a final decision (§ 1506.1).

(g) Environmental impact statements shall serve as the means of assessing the environmental impact of proposed agency actions, rather than justifying decisions already made.

§ 1502.3 Statutory requirements for statements.

As required by sec. 102(2)(C) of NEPA environmental impact statements (§ 1508.11) are to be included in every recommendation or report.

On proposals (§ 1508.23).

For legislation and (§ 1508.17).

Other major Federal actions (§ 1508.18).

Significantly (§ 1508.27).

Affecting (§§ 1508.3, 1508.8).

The quality of the human environment (§ 1508.14).

§ 1502.4 Major Federal actions requiring the preparation of environmental impact statements.

(a) Agencies shall make sure the proposal which is the subject of an environmental impact statement is properly defined. Agencies shall use the criteria for scope (§ 1508.25) to determine which proposal(s) shall be the subject of a particular statement. Proposals or parts of proposals which are related to each other closely enough to be, in effect, a single course of action shall be evaluated in a single impact statement.

(b) Environmental impact statements may be prepared, and are sometimes required, for broad Federal actions such as the adoption of new agency programs or regulations (§ 1508.18). Agencies shall prepare statements on broad actions so that they are relevant to policy and are timed to coincide with meaningful points in agency planning and decisionmaking.

(c) When preparing statements on broad actions (including proposals by more than one agency), agencies may find it useful to evaluate the proposal(s) in one of the following ways:

(1) Geographically, including actions occurring in the same general location, such as body of water, region, or metropolitan area.

(2) Generically, including actions which have relevant similarities, such as common timing, impacts, alternatives, methods of implementation, media, or subject matter.

(3) By stage of technological development including federal or federally assisted research, development or demonstration programs for new technologies which, if applied, could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Statements shall be prepared on such programs and shall be available before the program has reached a stage of investment or commitment to implementation likely to determine subsequent development or restrict later alternatives.

(d) Agencies shall as appropriate employ scoping (§ 1501.7), tiering (§ 1502.20), and other methods listed in §§ 1500.4 and 1500.5 to relate broad and narrow actions and to avoid duplication and delay.

§ 1502.5 Timing.

An agency shall commence preparation of an environmental impact statement as close as possible to the time the agency is developing or is presented with a proposal (§ 1508.23) so that preparation can be completed in time for the final statement to be included in any recommendation or report on the proposal. The statement shall be prepared early enough so that it can serve practically as an important contribution to the decisionmaking process and will not be used to rationalize or justify decisions already made (§§ 1500.2(c), 1501.2, and 1502.2). For instance:

(a) For projects directly undertaken by Federal agencies the environmental impact statement shall be prepared at the feasibility analysis (go-no go) stage and may be supplemented at a later stage if necessary.

(b) For applications to the agency appropriate environmental assessments or statements shall be commenced no later than immediately after the application is received. Federal agencies are encouraged to begin preparation of such assessments or statements earlier, preferably jointly with applicable State or local agencies.

(c) For adjudication, the final environmental impact statement shall normally precede the final staff recommendation and that portion of the public hearing related to the impact study. In appropriate circumstances the statement may follow preliminary hearings designed to gather information for use in the statements.

(d) For informal rulemaking the draft environmental impact statement shall normally accompany the proposed rule.

§ 1502.6 Interdisciplinary preparation.

Environmental impact statements shall be prepared using an interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts (section 102(2)(A) of the Act). The disciplines of the preparers shall be appropriate to the scope and issues identified in the scoping process (§ 1501.7).

§ 1502.7 Page limits.

The text of final environmental impact statements (e.g., paragraphs (d) through (g) of § 1502.10) shall normally be less than 150 pages and for proposals of unusual scope or complexity shall normally be less than 300 pages.

§ 1502.8 Writing.

Environmental impact statements shall be written in plain language and may use appropriate graphics so that decisionmakers and the public can readily understand them. Agencies should employ writers of clear prose or editors to write, review, or edit statements, which will be based upon the analysis and supporting data from the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts.

§ 1502.9 Draft, final, and supplemental statements.

Except for proposals for legislation as provided in § 1506.8 environmental impact statements shall be prepared in two stages and may be supplemented.

(a) Draft environmental impact statements shall be prepared in accordance with the scope decided upon in the scoping process. The lead agency shall work with the cooperating agencies and shall obtain comments as required in part 1503 of this chapter. The draft statement must fulfill and satisfy to the fullest extent possible the requirements established for final statements in section 102(2)(C) of the Act. If a draft statement is so inadequate as to preclude meaningful analysis, the agency shall prepare and circulate a revised draft of the appropriate portion. The agency shall make every effort to disclose and discuss at appropriate points in the draft statement all major points of view on the environmental impacts of the alternatives including the proposed action.

(b) Final environmental impact statements shall respond to comments as required in part 1503 of this chapter. The agency shall discuss at appropriate points in the final statement any responsible opposing view which was not adequately discussed in the draft statement and shall indicate the agency's response to the issues raised.

(c) Agencies:

(1) Shall prepare supplements to either draft or final environmental impact statements if:

(i) The agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns; or

(ii) There are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.

(2) May also prepare supplements when the agency determines that the purposes of the Act will be furthered by doing so.

(3) Shall adopt procedures for introducing a supplement into its formal administrative record, if such a record exists.

(4) Shall prepare, circulate, and file a supplement to a statement in the same fashion (exclusive of scoping) as a draft and final statement unless alternative procedures are approved by the Council.

§ 1502.10 Recommended format.

Agencies shall use a format for environmental impact statements which will encourage good analysis and clear presentation of the alternatives including the proposed action. The following standard format for environmental impact statements should be followed unless the agency determines that there is a compelling reason to do otherwise:

- (a) Cover sheet.
- (b) Summary.
- (c) Table of contents.
- (d) Purpose of and need for action.
- (e) Alternatives including proposed action (sections 102(2)(C)(iii) and 102(2)(E) of the Act).
- (f) Affected environment.
- (g) Environmental consequences (especially sections 102(2)(C)(i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of the Act).
- (h) List of preparers.
- (i) List of Agencies, Organizations, and persons to whom copies of the statement are sent.
- (j) Index.
- (k) Appendices (if any).

If a different format is used, it shall include paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (h), (i), and (j), of this section and shall include the substance of paragraphs (d), (e), (f), (g), and (k) of this section, as further described in §§ 1502.11 through 1502.18, in any appropriate format.

§ 1502.11 Cover sheet.

The cover sheet shall not exceed one page. It shall include:

(a) A list of the responsible agencies including the lead agency and any cooperating agencies.

(b) The title of the proposed action that is the subject of the statement (and if appropriate the titles of related cooperating agency actions), together with the State(s) and county(ies) (or other jurisdiction if applicable) where the action is located.

(c) The name, address, and telephone number of the person at the agency who can supply further information.

(d) A designation of the statement as a draft, final, or draft or final supplement.

(e) A one paragraph abstract of the statement.

(f) The date of which comments must be received (computed in cooperation with EPA under § 1506.10).

The information required by this section may be entered on Standard Form 424 (in items 4, 6, 7, 10, and 18).

§ 1502.12 Summary.

Each environmental impact statement shall contain a summary which adequately and accurately summarizes the statement. The summary shall stress the major conclusions, areas of controversy (including issues raised by agencies and the public), and the issues to be resolved (including the choice among alternatives). The summary will normally not exceed 15 pages.

§ 1502.13 Purpose and need.

The statement shall briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action.

§ 1502.14 Alternatives including the proposed action.

This section is the heart of the environmental impact statement. Based on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment (§ 1502.15) and the Environmental Consequences (§ 1502.16), it should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus, sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public. In this section agencies shall:

(a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.

(b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.

(c) Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

(d) Include the alternative of no action.

(e) Identify the agency's preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference.

(f) Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives.

§ 1502.15 Affected environment.

The environmental impact statement shall succinctly describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration. The description shall be no longer than is necessary to understand the effects of the alternatives. Data and analyses in a statement shall be commensurate with the importance of the impact, with less important material summarized, consolidated, or simply referenced. Agencies shall avoid useless bulk in statements and shall concentrate effort and attention on important issues. Verbose descriptions of the affected environment are themselves no measure of the adequacy of an environmental impact statement.

§ 1502.16 Environmental consequences.

This section forms the scientific and analytic basis for the comparisons under § 1502.14. It shall consolidate the discussions of those elements required by sections 102(2)(C)(i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of NEPA which are within the scope of the statement and as much of section 102(2)(C)(iii) as is necessary to support the comparisons. The discussion will include the environmental impacts of the alternatives including the proposed action, any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented, the relationship between short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposal should it be implemented. This section should not duplicate discussions in § 1502.14. It shall include discussions of:

- (a) Direct effects and their significance (§ 1508.8).
- (b) Indirect effects and their significance (§ 1508.8).
- (c) Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned. (See § 1506.2(d)).
- (d) The environmental effects of alternatives including the proposed action. The comparisons under § 1502.14 will be based on this discussion.
- (e) Energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- (f) Natural or depletable resource requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- (g) Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment, including the reuse and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- (h) Means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts (if not fully covered under § 1502.14(f)).

[43 FR 55994, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan. 3, 1979]

§ 1502.17 List of preparers.

The environmental impact statement shall list the names, together with their qualifications (expertise, experience, professional disciplines), of the persons who were primarily responsible for preparing the environmental impact statement or significant background papers, including basic components of the statement (§§ 1502.6 and 1502.8). Where possible the persons who are responsible for a particular analysis, including analyses in background papers, shall be identified. Normally the list will not exceed two pages.

§ 1502.18 Appendix.

If an agency prepares an appendix to an environmental impacts statement the appendix shall:

- (a) Consist of material prepared in connection with an environmental impact statement (as distinct from material which is not so prepared and which is incorporated by reference (§ 1502.21)).
- (b) Normally consist of material which substantiates any analysis fundamental to the impact statement.
- (c) Normally be analytic and relevant to the decision to be made.
- (d) Be circulated with the environmental impact statement or be readily available on request.

§ 1502.19 Circulation of the environmental impact statement.

Agencies shall circulate the entire draft and final environmental impact statements except for certain appendices as provided in § 1502.18(d) and unchanged statements as provided in § 1503.4(c). However, if the statement is unusually long, the agency may circulate the summary instead, except that the entire statement shall be furnished to:

- (a) Any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and any appropriate Federal, State or local agency authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards.

(b) The applicant, if any.

(c) Any person, organization, or agency requesting the entire environmental impact statement.

(d) In the case of a final environmental impact statement any person, organization, or agency which submitted substantive comments on the draft.

If the agency circulates the summary and thereafter receives a timely request for the entire statement and for additional time to comment, the time for that requestor only shall be extended by at least 15 days beyond the minimum period.

§ 1502.20 Tiering.

Agencies are encourage to tier their environmental impact statement to eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues and to focus on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review (§ 1508.28). Whenever a broad environmental impact statement has been prepared (such as a program or policy statement) and a subsequent statement or environmental assessment is then prepared on an action included within the entire program or policy (such as a site specific action) the subsequent statement or environmental assessment need only summarize the issues discussed in the broader statement and incorporate discussions from the broader statement by reference and shall concentrate on the issues specific to the subsequent action. The subsequent document shall state where the earlier document is available. Tiering may also be appropriate for different stages of actions (Section 1508.28).

§ 1502.21 Incorporation by reference.

Agencies shall incorporate material into an environmental impact statement by reference when the effect will be to cut down on bulk without impeding agency and public review of the action. The incorporated material shall be cited in the statement and its content briefly described. No material may be incorporated by reference unless it is reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment. Material

based on proprietary data which is itself not available for review and comment shall not be incorporated by reference.

§ 1502.22 Incomplete or unavailable information.

When an agency is evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there is incomplete or unavailable information, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking.

(a) If the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement.

(b) If the information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts cannot be obtained because the overall costs of obtaining it are exorbitant or the means to obtain it are not known, the agency shall include within the environmental impact statement:

(1) A statement that such information is incomplete or unavailable; (2) a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information to evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment; (3) a summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment, and (4) the agency's evaluation of such impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community. For the purposes of this section, "reasonably foreseeable" includes impacts which have catastrophic consequences, even if their probability of occurrence is low, provided that the analysis of the impacts is supported by credible scientific evidence, is not based on pure conjecture, and is within the rule of reason.

(c) The amended regulation will be applicable to all environmental impact statements for which a Notice of Intent (40 CFR 1508.22) is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on or after May 27, 1986. For environmental impact statements in progress, agencies may choose to comply with the requirements of either the original or amended regulation.

[51 FR 15625, Apr. 25, 1986]

§ 1502.23 Cost-benefit analysis.

If a cost-benefit analysis relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives is being considered for the proposed action, it shall be incorporated by reference or appended to the statement as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences. To assess the adequacy of compliance with section 102(2)(B) of the Act the statement shall, when a cost-benefit analysis is prepared, discuss the relationship between that analysis and any analyses of unquantified environmental impacts, values, and amenities. For purpose of complying with the Act, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of the various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations. In any event, an environmental impact statement should at least indicate those considerations, including factors not related to environmental quality, which are likely to be relevant and important to a decision.

§ 1502.24 Methodology and scientific accuracy.

Agencies shall insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in environmental impact statements. They shall identify any methodologies used and shall make explicit reference by footnote to the scientific and other sources relied upon for conclusions in the statement. An agency may place discussion of methodology in an appendix.

§ 1502.25 Environmental review and consultation requirements.

(a) To the fullest extent possible, agencies shall prepare draft environmental impact statements concurrently with and integrated with environmental impact analyses and related surveys and studies required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 *et seq.*), the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), and other environmental review laws and executive orders.

(b) The draft environmental impact statement shall list all Federal permits, licenses, and other entitlements which must be obtained in implementing the proposal. If it is uncertain whether a Federal permit, license, or other entitlement is necessary, the draft environmental impact statement shall so indicate.

PART 1503 — COMMENTING

Sec.

- 1503.1 Inviting comments.
- 1503.2 Duty to comment.
- 1503.3 Specificity of comments.
- 1503.4 Response to comments.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55997, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1503.1 Inviting comments.

(a) After preparing a draft environmental impact statement and before preparing a final environmental impact statement the agency shall:

- 1) Obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved or which is authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards.

(2) Request the comments of:

(i) Appropriate State and local agencies which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards;

(ii) Indian tribes, when the effects may be on a reservation; and

(iii) Any agency which has requested that it receive statements on actions of the kind proposed.

Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95 (Revised), through its system of clearinghouses, provides a means of securing the views of State and local environmental agencies. The clearinghouses may be used, by mutual agreement of the lead agency and the clearinghouse, for securing State and local reviews of the draft environmental impact statements.

(3) Request comments from the applicant, if any.

(4) Request comments from the public, affirmatively soliciting comments from those persons or organizations who may be interested or affected.

(b) An agency may request comments on a final environmental impact statement before the decision is finally made. In any case other agencies or persons may make comments before the final decision unless a different time is provided under § 1506.10.

§ 1503.2 Duty to comment.

Federal agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and agencies which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards shall comment on statements within their jurisdiction, expertise, or authority. Agencies shall comment within the time period specified for comment in § 1506.10. A Federal agency may reply that it has no comment. If a cooperating agency is satisfied that its views are adequately reflected in the environmental impact statement, it should reply that it has no comment.

§ 1503.3 Specificity of comments.

(a) Comments on an environmental impact statement or on a proposed action shall be as specific as possible and may address either the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed or both.

(b) When a commenting agency criticizes a lead agency's predictive methodology, the commenting agency should describe the alternative methodology which it prefers and why.

(c) A cooperating agency shall specify in its comments whether it needs additional information to fulfill other applicable environmental reviews or consultation requirements and what information it needs. In particular, it shall specify any additional information it needs to comment adequately on the draft statement's analysis of significant site-specific effects associated with the granting or approving by that cooperating agency of necessary Federal permits, licenses, or entitlements.

(d) When a cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law objects to or expresses reservations about the proposal on grounds of environmental impacts, the agency expressing the objection or reservation shall specify the mitigation measures it considers necessary to allow the agency to grant or approve applicable permit, license, or related requirements or concurrences.

§ 1503.4 Response to comments.

(a) An agency preparing a final environmental impact statement shall assess and consider comments both individually and collectively, and shall respond by one or more of the means listed below, stating its response in the final statement. Possible responses are to:

(1) Modify alternatives including the proposed action.

(2) Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency.

(3) Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses.

(4) Make factual corrections.

(5) Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

(b) All substantive comments received on the draft statement (or summaries thereof where the response has been exceptionally voluminous), should be attached to the final statement whether or not the comment is thought to merit individual discussion by the agency in the text of the statement.

(c) If changes in response to comments are minor and are confined to the responses described in paragraphs a(4) and (5) of this section, agencies may write them on errata sheets and attach them to the statement instead of rewriting the draft statement. In such cases only the comments, the responses, and the changes and not the final statement need be circulated (§ 1502.19). The entire document with a new cover sheet shall be filed as the final statement (§ 1506.9).

PART 1504 — PREDECISION REFERRALS TO THE COUNCIL OF PROPOSED FEDERAL ACTIONS DETERMINED TO BE ENVIRONMENTALLY UNSATISFACTORY

Sec.

1504.1 Purpose.

1504.2 Criteria for referral.

1504.3 Procedure for referrals and response.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

§ 1504.1 Purpose.

(a) This part establishes procedures for referring to the Council Federal interagency disagreements concerning proposed major Federal actions that might cause unsatisfactory environmental effects. It provides means for early resolution of such disagreements.

(b) Under section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is directed to review and comment publicly on the environmental impacts of Federal activities, including actions for which environmental impact statements are prepared. If after this review the Administrator determines that the matter is "unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality," section 309 directs that the matter be referred to the Council (hereafter "environmental referrals").

(c) Under section 102(2)(C) of the Act other Federal agencies may make similar reviews of environmental impact statements, including judgments on the acceptability of anticipated environmental impacts. These reviews must be made available to the President, the Council and the public.

[43 FR 55998, Nov. 29, 1978]

§ 1504.2 Criteria for referral.

Environmental referrals should be made to the Council only after concerted, timely (as early as possible in the process), but unsuccessful attempts to resolve differences with the lead agency. In determining what environmental objections to the matter are appropriate to refer to the Council, an agency should weigh potential adverse environmental impacts, considering:

(a) Possible violation of national environmental standards or policies.

(b) Severity.

(c) Geographical scope.

(d) Duration.

(e) Importance as precedents.

(f) Availability of environmentally preferable alternatives.

[43 FR 55998, Nov. 29, 1978]

§ 1504.3 Procedure for referrals and response.

(a) A Federal agency making the referral to the Council shall:

(1) Advise the lead agency at the earliest possible time that it intends to refer a matter to the Council unless a satisfactory agreement is reached.

(2) Include such advice in the referring agency's comments on the draft environmental impact statement, except when the statement does not contain adequate information to permit an assessment of the matter's environmental acceptability.

(3) Identify any essential information that is lacking and request that it be made available at the earliest possible time.

(4) Send copies of such advice to the Council.

(b) The referring agency shall deliver its referral to the Council not later than twenty-five (25) days after the final environmental impact statement has been made available to the Environmental Protection Agency, commenting agencies, and the public. Except when an extension of this period has been granted by the lead agency, the Council will not accept a referral after that date.

(c) The referral shall consist of:

(1) A copy of the letter signed by the head of the referring agency and delivered to the lead agency informing the lead agency of the referral and the reasons for it, and requesting that no action be taken to implement the matter until the Council acts upon the referral. The letter shall include a copy of the statement referred to in (c)(2) of this section.

(2) A statement supported by factual evidence leading to the conclusion that the matter is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. The statement shall:

(i) Identify any material facts in controversy and incorporate (by reference if appropriate) agreed upon facts.

(ii) Identify any existing environmental requirements or policies which would be violated by the matter.

(iii) Present the reasons why the referring agency believes the matter is environmentally unsatisfactory.

(iv) Contain a finding by the agency whether the issue raised is of national importance because of the threat to national environmental resources or policies or for some other reason.

(v) Review the steps taken by the referring agency to bring its concerns to the attention of the lead agency at the earliest possible time, and

(vi) Give the referring agency's recommendations as to what mitigation alternative, further study, or other course of action (including abandonment of the matter) are necessary to remedy the situation.

(d) Not later than twenty-five (25) days after the referral to the Council the lead agency may deliver a response to the Council, and the referring agency. If the lead agency requests more time and gives assurance that the matter will not go forward in the interim, the Council may grant an extension. The response shall:

(1) Address fully the issues raised in the referral.

(2) Be supported by evidence.

(3) Give the lead agency's response to the referring agency's recommendations.

(e) Interested persons (including the applicant) may deliver their views in writing to the Council. Views in support of the referral should be delivered not later than the referral. Views in support of the response shall be delivered not later than the response.

(f) Not later than twenty-five (25) days after receipt of both the referral and any response or upon being informed that there will be no response (unless the lead agency agrees to a longer time), the Council make take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Conclude that the process of referral and response has successfully resolved the problem.

(2) Initiate discussions with the agencies with the objective of mediation with referring and lead agencies.

(3) Hold public meetings or hearings to obtain additional views and information.

(4) Determine that the issue is not one of national importance and request the referring and lead agencies to pursue their decision process.

(5) Determine that the issue should be further negotiated by the referring and lead agencies and is not appropriate for Council consideration until one or more heads of agencies report to the Council that the agencies' disagreements are irreconcilable.

(6) Publish its findings and recommendations (including where appropriate a finding that the submitted evidence does not support the position of an agency).

(7) When appropriate, submit the referral and the response together with the Council's recommendation to the President for action.

(g) The Council shall take no longer than 60 days to complete the actions specified in paragraph (f)(2), (3), or (5) of this section.

(h) When the referral involves an action required by statute to be determined on the record after opportunity for agency hearing, the referral shall be conducted in a manner consistent with 5 U.S.C. 557(d) (Administrative Procedure Act).

[43 FR 55998, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan. 3, 1979]

PART 1505 — NEPA AND AGENCY DECISIONMAKING

Sec.

1505.1 Agency decisionmaking procedures.

1505.2 Record of decision in cases requiring environmental impact statements.

1505.3 Implementing the decision.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55999, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1505.1 Agency decisionmaking procedures.

Agencies shall adopt procedures (§ 1507.3) to ensure that decisions are made in accordance with the policies and purposes of the Act. Such procedures shall include but not be limited to:

(a) Implementing procedures under section 102(2) to achieve the requirements of sections 101 and 102(1).

(b) Designating the major decision points for the agency's principal programs likely to have a significant effect on the human environment and assuring that the NEPA process corresponds with them.

(c) Requiring that relevant environmental documents, comments, and responses be part of the record in formal rulemaking or adjudicatory proceedings.

(d) Requiring that relevant environmental documents, comments, and responses accompany the proposal through existing agency review processes so that agency officials use the statement in making decisions.

(e) Requiring that the alternatives considered by the decisionmaker are encompassed by the range of alternatives discussed in the relevant environmental documents and that the decisionmaker consider the alternatives described in the environmental impact statement. If another decision document accompanies the relevant environmental documents to the decisionmaker, agencies are encouraged to make available to the public before the decision is made any part of that document that relates to the comparison of alternatives.

§ 1505.2 Record of decision in cases requiring environmental impact statements.

At the time of its decision (§ 1506.10) or, if appropriate, its recommendation to Congress, each agency shall prepare a concise public record of decision. The record, which may be integrated into any other record prepared by the agency, including that required by OMB Circular A-95 (Revised), part I, sections 6(c) and (d), and part II, section 5(b)(4), shall:

(a) State what the decision was.

(b) Identify all alternatives considered by the agency in reaching its decision, specifying the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable. An agency may discuss preferences among alternatives based on relevant factors including economic and technical considerations and agency statutory missions. An agency shall identify and discuss all such factors including any essential considerations of national policy which were

balanced by the agency in making its decision and state how those considerations entered into its decision.

(c) State whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not. A monitoring and enforcement program shall be adopted and summarized where applicable for any mitigation.

§ 1505.3 Implementing the decision.

Agencies may provide for monitoring to assure that their decisions are carried out and should do so in important cases. Mitigation (§ 1505.2(c)) and other conditions established in the environmental impact statement or during its review and committed as part of the decision shall be implemented by the lead agency or other appropriate consenting agency. The lead agency shall:

(a) Include appropriate conditions in grants, permits or other approvals.

(b) Condition funding of actions on mitigation.

(c) Upon request, inform cooperating or commenting agencies on progress in carrying out mitigation measures which they have proposed and which were adopted by the agency making the decision.

(d) Upon request, make available to the public the results of relevant monitoring.

PART 1506 — OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF NEPA

Sec.

1506.1 Limitations on actions during NEPA process.

1506.2 Elimination of duplication with State and local procedures.

1506.3 Adoption.

1506.4 Combining documents.

1506.5 Agency responsibility.

1506.6 Public involvement.

1506.7 Further guidance.

1506.8 Proposals for legislation.

1506.9 Filing requirements.

1506.10 Timing of agency action.

1506.11 Emergencies.

1506.12 Effective date.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 56000, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1506.1 Limitations on actions during NEPA process.

(a) Until an agency issues a record of decision as provided in § 1505.2 (except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section), no action concerning the proposal shall be taken which would:

(1) Have an adverse environmental impact; or

(2) Limit the choice of reasonable alternatives.

(b) If any agency is considering an application from a non-Federal entity, and is aware that the applicant is about to take an action within the agency's jurisdiction that would meet either of the criteria in paragraph (a) of this section, then the agency shall promptly notify the applicant that the agency will take appropriate action to insure that the objectives and procedures of NEPA are achieved.

(c) While work on a required program environmental impact statement is in progress and the action is not covered by an existing program statement, agencies shall not undertake in the interim any major Federal action covered by the program which may significantly affect the quality of the human environment unless such action:

(1) Is justified independently of the program;

(2) Is itself accompanied by an adequate environmental impact statement; and

(3) Will not prejudice the ultimate decision on the program. Interim action prejudices the ultimate decision on the program when it tends to determine subsequent development or limit alternatives.

(d) This section does not preclude development by applicants of plans or designs or performance of other work necessary to support an application for Federal, State or local permits or assistance. Nothing in this section shall

preclude Rural Electrification Administration approval of minimal expenditures not affecting the environment (*e.g.*, long leadtime equipment and purchase options) made by non-governmental entities seeking loan guarantees from the Administration.

§ 1506.2 Elimination of duplication with State and local procedures.

(a) Agencies authorized by law to cooperate with State agencies of statewide jurisdiction pursuant to section 102(2)(D) of the Act may do so.

(b) Agencies shall cooperate with State and local agencies to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between NEPA and State and local requirements, unless the agencies are specifically barred from doing so by some other law. Except for cases covered by paragraph (a) of this section, such cooperation shall to the fullest extent possible include:

- (1) Joint planning processes.
- (2) Joint environmental research and studies.
- (3) Joint public hearings (except where otherwise provided by statute).
- (4) Joint environmental assessments.

(c) Agencies shall cooperate with State and local agencies to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between NEPA and comparable State and local requirements, unless the agencies are specifically barred from doing so by some other law. Except for cases covered by paragraph (a) of this section, such cooperation shall to the fullest extent possible include joint environmental impact statements. In such cases one or more Federal agencies and one or more State or local agencies shall be joint lead agencies. Where State laws or local ordinances have environmental impact statement requirements in addition to but not in conflict with those in NEPA, Federal agencies shall cooperate in fulfilling these requirements as well as those of Federal laws so that one document will comply with all applicable laws.

(d) To better integrate environmental impact statements into State or local planning processes, statements shall discuss any inconsistency of a proposed action with any approved State or local plan and laws (whether or not federally sanctioned). Where an inconsistency exists, the

statement should describe the extent to which the agency would reconcile its proposed action with the plan or law.

§ 1506.3 Adoption.

(a) An agency may adopt a Federal draft or final environmental impact statement or portion thereof provided that the statement or portion thereof meets the standards for an adequate statement under these regulations.

(b) If the actions covered by the original environmental impact statement and the proposed action are substantially the same, the agency adopting another agency's statement is not required to recirculate it except as a final statement. Otherwise the adopting agency shall treat the statement as a draft and recirculate it (except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section).

(c) A cooperating agency may adopt without recirculating the environmental impact statement or a lead agency when, after an independent review of the statement, the cooperating agency concludes that its comments and suggestions have been satisfied.

(d) When an agency adopts a statement which is not final within the agency that prepared it, or when the action it assesses is the subject of a referral under part 1504, or when the statement's adequacy is the subject of a judicial action where is not final, the agency shall so specify.

§ 1506.4 Combining documents.

Any environmental document in compliance with NEPA may be combined with any other agency document to reduce duplication and paperwork.

§ 1506.5 Agency responsibility.

(a) *Information.* If an agency requires an applicant to submit environmental information for possible use by the agency in preparing an environmental impact statement, then the agency should assist the applicant by outlining the types of information required. The agency shall independently evaluate the information submitted and shall be responsible for its accuracy. If the

agency chooses to use the information submitted by the applicant in the environmental impact statement, either directly or by reference, then the names of the persons responsible for the independent evaluation shall be included in the list of preparers (§ 1502.17). It is the intent of this paragraph that acceptable work not be redone, but that it be verified by the agency.

(b) *Environmental assessments.* If an agency permits an applicant to prepare an environmental assessment, the agency, besides fulfilling the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section, shall make its own evaluation of the environmental issues and take responsibility for the scope and content of the environmental assessment.

(c) *Environmental impact statements.* Except as provided in §§ 1506.2 and 1506.3 any environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to the requirements of NEPA shall be prepared directly by or by a contractor selected by the lead agency or where appropriate under § 1501.6(b), a cooperating agency. It is the intent of these regulations that the contractor be chosen solely by the lead agency, or by the lead agency in cooperation with cooperating agencies, or where appropriate by a cooperating agency to avoid any conflict of interest. Contractors shall execute a disclosure statement prepared by the lead agency, or where appropriate the cooperating agency, specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. If the document is prepared by contract, the responsible Federal official shall furnish guidance and participate in the preparation and shall independently evaluate the statement prior to its approval and take responsibility for its scope and contents. Nothing in this section is intended to prohibit any agency from requesting any person to submit information to it or to prohibit any person from submitting information to any agency.

§ 1506.6 Public involvement.

Agencies shall:

(a) Make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures.

(b) Provide public notice of NEPA-related hearings, public meetings, and the availability of environmental documents so as to inform those persons and agencies who may be interested or affected.

(1) In all cases the agency shall mail notice to those who have requested it on an individual action.

(2) In the case of an action with effects of national concern notice shall include publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER and notice by mail to national organizations reasonably expected to be interested in the matter and may include listing in the *102 Monitor*. An agency engaged in rule-making may provide notice by mail to national organizations who have requested that notice regularly be provided. Agencies shall maintain a list of such organizations.

(3) In the case of an action with effects primarily of local concern the notice may include:

(i) Notice to State and areawide clearing-houses pursuant to OMB Circular A-95 (Revised).

(ii) Notice to Indian tribes when effects may occur on reservations.

(iii) Following the affected State's public notice procedures for comparable actions.

(iv) Publication in local newspapers (in papers of general circulation rather than legal papers).

(v) Notice through other local media.

(vi) Notice to potentially interested community organizations including small business associations.

(vii) Publication in newsletters that may be expected to reach potentially interested persons.

(viii) Direct mailing to owners and occupants of nearby or affected property.

(ix) Posting of notice on and off site in the area where the action is to be located.

(c) Hold or sponsor public hearings or public meetings whenever appropriate or in accordance with statutory requirements applicable to the agency. Criteria shall include whether there is:

(1) Substantial environmental controversy concerning the proposed action or substantial interest in holding the hearing.

(2) A request for a hearing by another agency with jurisdiction over the action supported by reasons why a hearing will be helpful. If a draft environmental impact statement is to be considered at a public hearing, the agency should make the statement available to the public at least 15 days in advance (unless the purpose of the hearing is to provide information for the draft environmental impact statement).

(d) Solicit appropriate information from the public.

(e) Explain in its procedures where interested persons can get information or status reports on environmental impact statements and other elements of the NEPA process.

(f) Make environmental impact statements, the comments received, and any underlying documents available to the public pursuant to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), without regard to the exclusion for interagency memoranda where such memoranda transmit comments of Federal agencies on the environmental impact of the proposed action. Materials to be made available to the public shall be provided to the public without charge to the extent practicable, or at a fee which is not more than the actual costs of reproducing copies required to be sent to other Federal agencies, including the Council.

§ 1506.7 Further guidance.

The Council may provide further guidance concerning NEPA and its procedures including:

(a) A handbook which the Council may supplement from time to time, which shall in plain language provide guidance and instructions concerning the application of NEPA and these regulations.

(b) Publication of the Council's Memoranda to Heads of Agencies.

(c) In conjunction with the Environmental Protection Agency and the publication of the 102 Monitor, notice of:

(1) Research activities:

(2) Meetings and conferences related to NEPA; and

(3) Successful and innovative procedures used by agencies to implement NEPA.

§ 1506.8 Proposals for legislation.

(a) The NEPA process for proposals for legislation (§ 1508.17) significantly affecting the quality of the human environment shall be integrated with the legislative process of the Congress. A legislative environmental impact statement is the detailed statement required by law to be included in a recommendation or report on a legislative proposal to Congress. A legislative environmental impact statement shall be considered part of the formal transmittal of a legislative proposal to Congress; however, it may be transmitted to Congress up to 30 days later in order to allow time for completion of an accurate statement which can serve as the basis for public and Congressional debate. The statement must be available in time for Congressional hearings and deliberations.

(b) Preparation of a legislative environmental impact statement shall conform to the requirements of these regulations except as follows:

(1) There need not be a scoping process.

(2) The legislative statement shall be prepared in the same manner as a draft statement, but shall be considered the "detailed statement" required by statute; *Provided*, That when any of the following conditions exist both the draft and final environmental impact statement on the legislative proposal shall be prepared and circulated as provided by §§ 1503.1 and 1506.10.

(i) A Congressional Committee with jurisdiction over the proposal has a rule requiring both draft and final environmental impact statements.

(ii) The proposal results from a study process required by statute (such as those required by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 *et seq.*) and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 *et seq.*)).

(iii) Legislative approval is sought for Federal or federally assisted construction or other projects which the agency recommends be located at specific geographic locations. For proposals requiring an environmental impact statement for the acquisition of space by the General Services Administration, a draft statement shall

accompany the prospectus or the 11(b) Report of Building Project Surveys to the Congress, and a final statement shall be completed before site acquisition.

(iv) The agency decides to prepare draft and final statements.

(c) Comments on the legislative statement shall be given to the lead agency which shall forward them along with its own responses to the Congressional committees with jurisdiction.

§ 1506.9 Filing requirements.

Environmental impact statements together with comments and responses shall be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency, attention Office of Federal Activities (A-104), 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460. Statements shall be filed with EPA no earlier than they are also transmitted to commenting agencies and made available to the public. EPA shall deliver one copy of each statement to the Council, which shall satisfy the requirements of availability to the President. EPA may issue guidelines to agencies to implement the responsibilities under this section and § 1506.10.

§ 1506.10 Timing of agency action.

(a) The Environmental Protection Agency shall publish a notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER each week of the environmental impact statements filed during the preceding week. The minimum time periods set forth in this section shall be calculated from the date of publication of this notice.

(b) No decision on the proposed action shall be made or recorded under § 1505.2 by a Federal agency until the later of the following dates:

(1) Ninety (90) days after publication of the notice described above in paragraph (a) of this section for a draft environmental impact statement.

(2) Thirty (30) days after publication of the notice described above in paragraph (a) of this section for a final environmental impact statement.

An exception to the rules on timing may be made in the case of an agency decision which is subject to a formal internal appeal. Some agencies have

a formally established appeal process which allows other agencies or the public to take appeals on a decision and make their views known, after publication of the final environmental impact statement. In such cases, where a real opportunity exists to alter the decision, the decision may be made and recorded at the same time the environmental impact statement is published. This means that the period for appeal of the decision and the 30-day period prescribed in paragraph (b)(2) of this section may run concurrently. In such cases the environmental impact statement shall explain the timing and the public's right of appeal. An agency engaged in rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act or other statute for the purpose of protecting the public health or safety, may waive the time period in paragraph (b)(2) of this section and publish a decision on the final rule simultaneously with publication of the notice of the availability of the final environmental impact statement as described in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) If the final environmental impact statement is filed within ninety (90) days after a draft environmental impact statement is filed with the Environmental Protection Agency, the minimum thirty (30) day period and the minimum ninety (90) day period may run concurrently. However, subject to paragraph (d) of this section agencies shall allow not less than 45 days for comments on draft statements.

(d) The lead agency may extend prescribed periods. The Environmental Protection Agency may upon a showing by the lead agency of compelling reasons of national policy reduce the prescribed periods and may upon a showing by any other Federal agency of compelling reasons of national policy also extend prescribed periods, but only after consultation with the lead agency. (Also see § 1507.3(d).) Failure to file timely comments shall not be a sufficient reason for extending a period. If the lead agency does not concur with the extension of time, EPA may not extend it for more than 30 days. When the Environmental Protection Agency reduces or extends any period of time it shall notify the Council.

[43 FR 56000, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 874, Jan. 3, 1979]

§ 1506.11 Emergencies.

Where emergency circumstances make it necessary to take an action with significant environmental impact without observing the provisions of these regulations, the Federal agency taking the action should consult with the Council about alternative arrangements. Agencies and the Council will limit such arrangements to actions necessary to control the immediate impacts of the emergency. Other actions remain subject to NEPA review.

§ 1506.12 Effective date.

The effective date of these regulations is July 30, 1979, except that for agencies that administer programs that qualify under section 102(2)(D) of the Act or under section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 an additional four months shall be allowed for the State or local agencies to adopt their implementing procedures.

(a) These regulations shall apply to the fullest extent practicable to ongoing activities and environmental documents begun before the effective date. These regulations do not apply to an environmental impact statement or supplement if the draft statement was filed before the effective date of these regulations. No completed environmental documents need be redone by reasons of these regulations. Until these regulations are applicable, the Council's guidelines published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 1, 1973, shall continue to be applicable. In cases where these regulations are applicable the guidelines are superseded. However, nothing shall prevent an agency from proceeding under these regulations at an earlier time.

(b) NEPA shall continue to be applicable to actions begun before January 1, 1970, to the fullest extent possible.

PART 1507 — AGENCY COMPLIANCE

Sec.

1507.1 Compliance.

1507.2 Agency capability to comply.

1507.3 Agency procedures.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 56002, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1507.1 Compliance.

All agencies of the Federal Government shall comply with these regulations. It is the intent of these regulations to allow each agency flexibility in adapting its implementing procedures authorized by § 1507.3 to the requirements of other applicable laws.

§ 1507.2 Agency capability to comply.

Each agency shall be capable (in terms of personnel and other resources) of complying with the requirements enumerated below. Such compliance may include use of other's resources, but the using agency shall itself have sufficient capability to evaluate what others do for it. Agencies shall:

(a) Fulfill the requirements of section 102(2)(A) of the Act to utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decisionmaking which may have an impact on the human environment. Agencies shall designate a person to be responsible for overall review of agency NEPA compliance.

(b) Identify methods and procedures required by section 102(2)(B) to insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration.

(c) Prepare adequate environmental impact statements pursuant to section 102(2)(C) and comment on statements in the areas where the agency has jurisdiction by law or special expertise or is authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards.

(d) Study, develop, and describe alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. This requirement of section 102(2)(E)

extends to all such proposals, not just the more limited scope of section 102(2)(C)(iii) where the discussion of alternatives is confined to impact statements.

(e) Comply with the requirements of section 102(2)(H) that the agency initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects.

(f) Fulfill the requirements of sections 102(2)(F), 102(2)(G), and 102(2)(I), of the Act and of Executive Order 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality, Sec. 2.

§ 1507.3 Agency procedures.

(a) Not later than eight months after publication of these regulations as finally adopted in the FEDERAL REGISTER, or five months after the establishment of an agency, whichever shall come later, each agency shall as necessary adopt procedures to supplement these regulations. When the agency is a department, major subunits are encouraged (with the consent of the department) to adopt their own procedures. Such procedures shall not paraphrase these regulations. They shall confine themselves to implementing procedures. Each agency shall consult with the Council while developing its procedures and before publishing them in the FEDERAL REGISTER for comment. Agencies with similar programs should consult with each other and the Council to coordinate their procedures, especially for programs requesting similar information from applicants. The procedures shall be adopted only after an opportunity for public review and after review by the Council for conformity with the Act and these regulations. The Council shall complete its review within 30 days. Once in effect they shall be filed with the Council and made readily available to the public. Agencies are encouraged to publish explanatory guidance for these regulations and their own procedures. Agencies shall continue to review their policies and procedures and in consultation with the Council to revise them as necessary to ensure full compliance with the purposes and provisions of the Act.

(b) Agency procedures shall comply with these regulations except where compliance would be inconsistent with statutory requirements and shall include:

(1) Those procedures required by §§ 1501.2(d), 1502.9(c)(3), 1505.1, 1506.6(e), and 1508.4.

(2) Specific criteria for and identification of those typical classes of action:

(i) Which normally do require environmental impact statements.

(ii) Which normally do not require either an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment (categorical exclusions (§ 1508.4)).

(iii) Which normally require environmental assessments but not necessarily environmental impact statements.

(c) Agency procedures may include specific criteria for providing limited exceptions to the provisions of these regulations for classified proposals. They are proposed actions which are specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive Order or statute to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy and are in fact properly classified pursuant to such Executive Order or statute. Environmental assessments and environmental impact statements which address classified proposals may be safeguarded and restricted from public dissemination in accordance with agencies' own regulations applicable to classified information. These documents may be organized so that classified portions can be included as annexes, in order that the unclassified portions can be made available to the public.

(d) Agency procedures may provide for periods of time other than those presented in § 1506.10 when necessary to comply with other specific statutory requirements.

(e) Agency procedures may provide that where there is a lengthy period between the agency's decision to prepare an environmental impact statement and the time of actual preparation, the notice of intent required by § 1501.7 may be published at a reasonable time in advance of preparation of the draft statement.

PART 1508 — TERMINOLOGY AND INDEX

Sec.

- 1508.1 Terminology.
- 1508.2 Act.
- 1508.3 Affecting.
- 1508.4 Categorical exclusion.
- 1508.5 Cooperating agency.
- 1508.6 Council.
- 1508.7 Cumulative impact.
- 1508.8 Effects.
- 1508.9 Environmental assessment.
- 1508.10 Environmental document.
- 1508.11 Environmental impact statement.
- 1508.12 Federal agency.
- 1508.13 Finding of no significant impact.
- 1508.14 Human environment.
- 1508.15 Jurisdiction by law.
- 1508.16 Lead agency.
- 1508.17 Legislation.
- 1508.18 Major Federal action.
- 1508.19 Matter.
- 1508.20 Mitigation.
- 1508.21 NEPA process.
- 1508.22 Notice of intent.
- 1508.23 Proposal.
- 1508.24 Referring agency.
- 1508.25 Scope.
- 1508.26 Special expertise.
- 1508.27 Significantly.
- 1508.28 Tiering.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 56003, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1508.1 Terminology.

The terminology of this part shall be uniform throughout the Federal Government.

§ 1508.2 Act.

Act means the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et seq.*) which is also referred to as “NEPA.”

§ 1508.3 Affecting.

Affecting means will or may have an effect on.

§ 1508.4 Categorical exclusion.

Categorical exclusion means a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and which have been found to have no such effect in procedures adopted by a Federal agency in implementation of these regulations (§ 1507.3) and for which, therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required. An agency may decide in its procedures or otherwise, to prepare environmental assessments for the reasons stated in § 1508.9 even though it is not required to do so. Any procedures under this section shall provide for extraordinary circumstances in which a normally excluded action may have a significant environmental effect.

§ 1508.5 Cooperating agency.

Cooperating agency means any Federal agency other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The selection and responsibilities of a cooperating agency are described in § 1501.6. A State or local agency or similar qualifications or, when the effects are on a reservation, an Indian Tribe, may by agreement with the lead agency become a cooperating agency.

§ 1508.6 Council.

Council means the Council on Environmental Quality established by title II of the Act.

§ 1508.7 Cumulative impact.

Cumulative impact is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

§ 1508.8 Effects.

Effects include:

(a) Direct effects, which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place.

(b) Indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.

Effects and impacts as used in these regulations are synonymous. Effects includes ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. Effects may also include those resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the agency believes that the effect will be beneficial.

§ 1508.9 Environmental assessment.

Environmental assessment:

(a) Means a concise public document for which a Federal agency is responsible that serves to:

(1) Briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or a finding of no significant impact.

(2) Aid an agency's compliance with the Act when no environmental impact statement is necessary.

(3) Facilitate preparation of a statement when one is necessary.

(b) Shall include brief discussions of the need for the proposal, of alternatives as required by section 102(2)(E), of the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and a listing of agencies and persons consulted.

§ 1508.10 Environmental document.

Environmental document includes the documents specified in § 1508.9 (environmental assessment), § 1508.11 (environmental impact statement), § 1508.13 (finding of no significant impact), and § 1508.22 (notice of intent).

§ 1508.11 Environmental impact statement.

Environmental impact statement means a detailed written statement as required by section 102(2)(C) of the Act.

§ 1508.12 Federal agency.

Federal agency means all agencies of the Federal Government. It does not mean the Congress, the Judiciary, or the President, including the performance of staff functions for the President in his Executive Office. It also includes for purposes of these regulations, States and units of general local government and Indian tribes assuming NEPA responsibilities under section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

§ 1508.13 Finding of no significant impact.

Finding of no significant impact means a document by a Federal agency briefly presenting the reasons why an action, not otherwise

excluded (§ 1508.4), will not have a significant effect on the human environment and for which an environmental impact statement therefore will not be prepared. It shall include the environmental assessment or a summary of it and shall note any other environmental documents related to it (§ 1501.7(a)(5)). If the assessment is included, the finding need not repeat any of the discussion in the assessment but may incorporate it by reference.

§ 1508.14 Human environment.

Human environment shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment. (See the definition of “effects” (§ 1508.8).) This means that economic or social effects are not intended by themselves to require preparation of an environmental impact statement. When an environmental impact statement is prepared and economic or social and natural or physical environmental effects are interrelated, then the environmental impact statement will discuss all of these effects on the human environment.

§ 1508.15 Jurisdiction by law.

Jurisdiction by law means agency authority to approve, veto, or finance all or part of the proposal.

§ 1508.16 Lead agency.

Lead agency means the agency or agencies preparing or having taken primary responsibility for preparing the environmental impact statement.

§ 1508.17 Legislation.

Legislation includes a bill or legislative proposal to Congress developed by or with the significant cooperation and support of a Federal agency, but does not include requests for appropriations. The test for significant cooperation is whether the proposal is in fact predominantly that of the agency rather than another source. Drafting does not by itself

constitute significant cooperation. Proposals for legislation include requests for ratification of treaties. Only the agency which has primary responsibility for the subject matter involved will prepare a legislative environmental impact statement.

§ 1508.18 Major Federal action.

Major Federal action includes actions with effects that may be major and which are potentially subject to Federal control and responsibility. Major reinforces but does not have a meaning independent of significantly (§ 1508.27). Actions include the circumstance where the responsible officials fail to act and that failure to act is reviewable by courts or administrative tribunals under the Administrative Procedure Act or other applicable law as agency action.

(a) Actions include new and continuing activities, including projects and programs entirely or partly financed, assisted, conducted, regulated, or approved by federal agencies; new or revised agency rules, regulations, plans, policies, or procedures; and legislative proposals (§§ 1506.8, 1508.17). Actions do not include funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds, distributed under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, 31 U.S.C. 1221 *et seq.*, with no Federal agency control over the subsequent use of such funds. Actions do not include bringing judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions.

(b) Federal actions tend to fall within one of the following categories:

(1) Adoption of official policy, such as rules, regulations, and interpretations adopted pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.*; treaties and international conventions or agreements; formal documents establishing an agency's policies which will result in or substantially alter agency programs.

(2) Adoption of formal plans, such as official documents prepared or approved by federal agencies which guide or prescribe alternative uses of Federal resources, upon which future agency actions will be based.

(3) Adoption of programs, such as a group of concerted actions to implement a specific policy or plan; systematic and connected agency decisions allocating agency resources to implement a specific statutory program or executive directive.

(4) Approval of specific projects, such as construction or management activities located in a defined geographic area. Projects include actions approved by permit or other regulatory decision as well as federal and federally assisted activities.

§ 1508.19 Matter.

Matter includes for purposes of part 1504:

(a) With respect to the Environmental Protection Agency, any proposed legislation, project, action or regulation as those terms are used in section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609).

(b) With respect to all other agencies, any proposed major federal action to which section 102(2)(C) of NEPA applies.

§ 1508.20 Mitigation.

Mitigation includes:

(a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.

(b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(c) Rectifying the impact of repairing, rehabilitation, or restoring the affected environment.

(d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

§ 1508.21 NEPA process.

NEPA process means all measures necessary for compliance with the requirements of section 2 and title I or NEPA.

§ 1508.22 Notice of intent.

Notice of intent means a notice that an environmental impact statement will be prepared and considered. The notice shall briefly:

(a) Describe the proposed action and possible alternatives.

(b) Describe the agency's proposed scoping process including whether, when, and where any scoping meeting will be held.

(c) State the name and address of a person within the agency who can answer questions about the proposed action and the environmental impact statement.

§ 1508.23 Proposal.

Proposal exists at that stage in the development of an action when an agency subject to the Act has a goal and is actively preparing to make a decision on one or more alternative means of accomplishing that goal and the effects can be meaningfully evaluated. Preparation of an environmental impact statement on a proposal should be timed (§ 1502.5) so that the final statement may be completed in time for the statement to be included in any recommendation or report on the proposal. A proposal may exist in fact as well as by agency declaration that one exists.

§ 1508.24 Referring agency.

Referring agency means the federal agency which has referred any matter to the Council after a determination that the matter is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality.

§ 1508.25 Scope.

Scope consists of the range of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be considered in an environmental impact statement. The scope of an individual statement may depend on its relationships to other statements (§§ 1502.20 and 1508.28). To determine the scope of environmental impact statements, agencies shall consider 3 types of actions, 3 types of alternatives, and 3 types of impacts. They include:

(a) Actions (other than unconnected single actions) which may be:

(1) Connected actions, which means that they are closely related and therefore should be discussed in the same impact statement. Actions are connected if they:

(i) Automatically trigger other actions which may require environmental impact statements.

(ii) Cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously.

(iii) Are interdependent parts of a larger action and depend on the larger action for their justification.

(2) Cumulative actions, which when viewed with other proposed actions have cumulatively significant impacts and should therefore be discussed in the same impact statement.

(3) Similar actions, which when viewed with other reasonably foreseeable or proposed agency actions, have similarities that provide a basis for evaluating their environmental consequences together, such as common timing or geography. An agency may wish to analyze these actions in the same impact statement. It should do so when the best way to assess adequately the combined impacts of similar actions or reasonable alternatives to such actions is to treat them in a single impact statement.

(b) Alternatives, which include: (1) No action alternative.

(2) Other reasonable courses of actions.

(3) Mitigation measures (not in the proposed action).

(c) Impacts, which may be: (1) Direct; (2) indirect; (3) cumulative.

§ 1508.26 Special expertise.

Special expertise means statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience.

§ 1508.27 Significantly.

Significantly as used in NEPA requires considerations of both context and intensity:

(a) *Context*. This means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies

with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant.

(b) *Intensity*. This refers to the severity of impact. Responsible officials must bear in mind that more than one agency may make decisions about partial aspects of a major action. The following should be considered in evaluating intensity:

(1) Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.

(2) The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

(3) Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

(4) The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

(5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

(6) The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

(7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts.

(8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

(9) The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(10) Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

[43 FR 56003, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 874, Jan. 3, 1979]

§ 1508.28 Tiering.

Tiering refers to the coverage of general matters in broader environmental impact statements (such as national program or policy statements) with subsequent narrower statements or environmental analyses (such as regional or basinwide program statements or ultimately site-specific statements) incorporating by reference the general discussions and concentrating solely on the issues specific to the statement subsequently prepared. Tiering is appropriate when the sequence of statements or analyses is:

(a) From a program, plan, or policy environmental impact statement to a program, plan, or policy statement or analysis of lesser scope or to a site-specific statement or analysis.

(b) From an environmental impact statement on a specific action at an early stage (such as need and site selection) to a supplement (which is preferred) or a subsequent statement or analysis at a later stage (such as environmental mitigation). Tiering in such cases is appropriate when it helps the lead agency to focus on the issues which are ripe for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ripe.

Index to Parts 1500 Through 1508

EDITORIAL NOTE: This listing is provided for information purposes only. It is compiled and kept up-to-date by the Council on Environmental Quality.

INDEX		INDEX — Continued	
Act	1508.2.	Environmental Consequences	1502.10(g), 1502.16.
Action	1508.18, 1508.25.	Environmental Consultation	1500.4(k), 1500.5(g),
Action-forcing	1500.1, 1502.1.	Requirements.	1501.7(a)(6), 1502.25,
Adoption	1500.4(n), 1500.5(h), 1506.3.		1503.3(c).
Affected Environment	1502.10(f), 1502.15.	Environmental Documents	1508.10.
Affecting	1502.3, 1508.3.	Environmental Impact State-	1500.4, 1501.4(c), 1501.7,
Agency Authority	1500.6.	ment.	1501.3, 1502.1, 1502.2,
Agency Capability	1501.2(a), 1507.2.		1502.3, 1502.4, 1502.5,
Agency Compliance	1507.1.		1502.6, 1502.7, 1502.8,
Agency Procedures	1505.1, 1507.3.		1502.9, 1502.10, 1502.11,
Agency Responsibility	1506.5.		1502.12, 1502.13,
Alternatives	1501.2(c), 1502.2,		1502.14, 1502.15,
	1502.10(e), 1502.14,		1502.16, 1502.17,
	1505.1(e), 1505.2,		1502.18, 1502.19,
	1507.2(d), 1508.25(b).		1502.20, 1502.21,
Appendices	1502.10(k), 1502.18,		1502.22, 1502.23,
	1502.24.		1502.24, 1502.25,
Applicant	1501.2(d)(1), 1501.4(b),		1506.2(b)(4), 1506.3,
	1501.8(a), 1502.19(b),		1506.8, 1506.11.
	1503.1(a)(3), 1504.3(e),	Environmental Protection	1502.11(f), 1504.1, 1504.3,
	1506.1(d), 1506.5(a),	Agency.	1506.7(c), 1508.9,
	1506.5(b).		1506.10, 1506.19(a).
Apply NEPA Early in the	1501.2.	Environmental Review Re-	1500.4(k), 1500.5(g),
Process		quirements.	1501.7(a)(6), 1502.25,
Categorical Exclusion	1500.4(p), 1500.5(k),		1503.3(c).
	1501.4(a), 1507.3(b),	Expediter	1501.8(b)(2).
	1508.4.	Federal Agency	1508.12.
Circulating of Environmental	1502.19, 1506.3.	Filing	1506.9.
Impact Statement.		Final Environmental Impact	1502.9(b), 1503.1, 1503.4(b).
Classified Information	1507.3(c).	Statement.	
Clean Air Act	1504.1, 1508.19(a).	Finding of No Significant Im-	1500.3, 1500.4(q), 1500.5(1),
Combining Documents	1500.4(o), 1500.5(l), 1506.4.	pact.	1501.4(e), 1508.13.
Commenting	1502.19, 1503.1, 1503.2,	Fish and Wildlife Coordination	1502.25.
	1503.3, 1503.4, 1506.6(f).	Act.	
Consultation Requirement	1500.4(k), 1500.5(g),	Format for Environmental Im-	1502.10.
	1501.7(a)(6), 1502.25.	impact Statement.	
Context	1508.27(a).	Freedom of Information Act	1506.6(f).
Cooperating Agency	1500.5(b), 1501.1(b),	Further Guidance	1506.7.
	1501.5(c), 1501.5(f),	Generic	1502.4(c)(2).
	1501.6, 1503.1(a)(1),	General Services Administra-	1506.8(b)(2)(iii).
	1503.2, 1503.3, 1506.3(c),	tion.	
	1506.5(a), 1508.5.	Geographic	1502.4(c)(1).
Cost-Benefit	1502.23.	Graphics	1502.8.
Council on Environmental	1500.3, 1501.5(e), 1501.5(f),	Handbook	1506.7(a).
Quality.	1501.6(c), 1502.9(c)(4),	Housing and Community De-	1506.12, 1508.12.
	1504.1, 1504.2, 1504.3,	velopment Act.	
	1506.6(f), 1506.9,	Human Environment	1502.3, 1502.22, 1508.14.
	1506.10(d), 1506.11,	Impacts	1508.8, 1508.25(c).
	1507.3, 1508.6, 1508.24.	Implementing the Decision	1505.3.
Cover Sheet	1502.10(a), 1502.11.	Incomplete or Unavailable In-	1502.22.
Cumulative Impact	1508.7, 1508.25(a),	formation.	
	1508.25(c).	Incorporation by Reference	1500.4(j), 1502.21.
Decisionmaking	1505.1, 1506.1.	Index	1502.10(j).
Decision points	1505.1(b).	Indian Tribes	1501.2(d)(2), 1501.7(a)(1),
Dependent	1508.25(a).		1502.16(c),
Draft Environmental Impact	1502.9(a).		1503.1(a)(2)(ii),
Statement.			1506.6(b)(3)(ii), 1508.5,
Early Application of NEPA	1501.2.		1508.12.
Economic Effects	1508.8.	Intensity	1508.27(b).
Effective Date	1506.12.	Interdisciplinary Preparation	1502.6, 1502.17.
Effects	1502.16, 1508.8.	Interim Actions	1506.1.
Emergencies	1506.11.	Interdisciplinary Preparation	1502.6, 1502.17.
Endangered Species Act	1502.25, 1508.27(b)(9).	Interim Actions	1506.1.
Energy	1502.16(e).	Joint Lead Agency	1501.5(b), 1506.2.
Environmental Assessment	1501.3, 1501.4(b), 1501.4(c),	Judicial Review	1500.3.
	1501.7(b)(3), 1506.2(b)(4),	Jurisdiction by Law	1508.15.
	1506.5(b), 1508.4, 1508.9,		
	1508.10, 1508.13.		

INDEX	
Lead Agency.....	1500.5(c), 1501.1(c), 1501.5, 1501.6, 1501.7, 1501.8, 1504.3, 1506.2(b)(4), 1506.8(a), 1506.10(d), 1508.16.
Legislation	1500.5(j), 1502.3, 1506.8, 1508.17, 1508.18(a).
Limitation on Action During NEPA Process.....	1506.1.
List of Preparers	1502.10(h), 1502.17.
Local or State	1500.4(n), 1500.5(h), 1501.2(d)(2), 1501.5(b), 1501.5(d), 1501.7(a)(1), 1501.8(c), 1502.16(c), 1503.1(a)(2), 1506.2(b), 1506.6(b)(3), 1508.5, 1508.12, 1508.18.
Major Federal Action.....	1502.3, 1508.18.
Mandate	1500.3.
Matter	1504.1, 1504.2, 1504.3, 1508.19.
Methodology	1502.24.
Mitigation	1502.14(f), 1502.16(h), 1503.3(d), 1505.2(c), 1505.3, 1508.20.
Monitoring.....	1505.2(c), 1505.3.
National Historic Preservation Act.....	1502.25.
National Register of Historical Places.....	1508.27(b)(8).
Natural or Depletable Resource Requirements.....	1502.16(f).
Need for Action	1502.10(d), 1502.13.
NEPA Process	1508.21.
Non-Federal Sponsor	1502.2(d).
Notice of Intent	1501.7, 1507.3(e), 1508.22.
OMB Circular A-95	1503.1(a)(2)(iii), 1505.2, 1506.6(b)(3)(i).
102 Monitor	1506.6(b)(2), 1506.7(c).
Ongoing Activities.....	1506.12.
Page Limits.....	1500.4(a), 1501.7(b), 1502.7.
Planning	1500.5(a), 1501.2(b), 1502.4(a), 1508.18.
Policy	1500.2, 1502.4(b), 1508.18(a).
Program Environmental Impact Statement.....	1500.4(l), 1502.4, 1502.20, 1508.18.
Programs	1502.4, 1508.18(b)
Projects	1508.18.
Proposal	1502.4, 1502.5, 1506.8, 1508.23.
Proposed Action	1502.10(e), 1502.14, 1506.2(c).
Public Health and Welfare	1504.1.

INDEX — Continued	
Public Involvement.....	1501.4(e), 1503.1(a)(3), 1506.6.
Purpose	1500.1, 1501.1, 1502.1, 1504.1.
Purpose of Action.....	1502.10(d), 1502.13.
Record of Decision.....	1505.2, 1506.1.
Referrals	1504.1, 1504.2, 1504.3, 1506.3(d).
Referring Agency	1504.1, 1504.2, 1504.3.
Response to Comments	1503.4.
Rural Electrification Administration.....	1506.1(d).
Scientific Accuracy.....	1502.24.
Scope	1502.4(a), 1502.9(a), 1508.25.
Scoping.....	1500.4(b), 1501.1(d), 1501.4(d), 1501.7, 1502.9(a), 1506.8(a).
Significantly.....	1502.3, 1508.27.
Similar	1508.25.
Small Business Associations	1506.6(b)(3)(vi).
Social Effects	1508.8.
Special Expertise	1508.26.
Specificity of Comments	1500.4(1), 1503.3.
State and Areawide Clearing-houses.....	1501.4(e)(2), 1503.1(a)(2)(iii), 1506.6(b)(3)(i).
State and Local	1500.4(n), 1500.5(h), 1501.2(d)(2), 1501.5(b), 1501.5(d), 1501.7(a)(1), 1501.8(c), 1502.16(c), 1503.1(a)(2), 1506.2(b), 1506.6(b)(3), 1508.5, 1508.12, 1508.18.
State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act.....	1508.18(a).
Summary	1500.4(h), 1502.10(b), 1502.12.
Supplements to Environmental Impact Statements.....	1502.9(c).
Table of Contents.....	1502.10(c).
Technological Development.....	1502.4(c)(3).
Terminology	1508.1.
Tiering	1500.4(i), 1502.4(d), 1502.20, 1508.28.
Time Limits	1500.5(e), 1501.1(e), 1501.7(b)(2), 1501.8.
Timing	1502.4, 1502.5, 1506.10.
Treaties	1508.17.
When to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.....	1501.3.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.....	1506.8(b)(ii).
Wilderness Act.....	1506.8(b)(ii).
Writing	1502.

PART 771 — ENVIRONMENTAL, IMPACT AND RELATED PROCEDURES

Sec.

- 771.101 Purpose.
- 771.103 [Reserved]
- 771.105 Policy.
- 771.107 Definitions.
- 771.109 Applicability and responsibilities.
- 771.111 Early coordination, public involvement and project development.
- 771.113 Timing of Administration activities.
- 771.115 Classes of actions.
- 771.117 Categorical exclusions.
- 771.119 Environmental assessments.
- 771.121 Findings of no significant impact.
- 771.123 Draft environmental impact statements.
- 771.125 Final environmental impact statements.
- 771.127 Record of decision.
- 771.129 Re-evaluations.
- 771.130 Supplemental environmental impact statements.
- 771.131 Emergency action procedures.
- 771.133 Compliance with other requirements.
- 771.135 Section 4(f) (49 U.S.C. 303).
- 771.137 International actions.

AUTHORITY: 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*; 23 U.S.C. 109, 128, 138 and 315; 49 U.S.C. 303(c), 1602(d), 1604(h), 1604(i), and 1610; 40 CFR part 1500 *et seq.*; 49 CFR 1.48(b) and 1.51.

SOURCE: 52 FR 32660, Aug. 28, 1987, unless otherwise noted.

§ 771.101 Purpose.

This regulation prescribes the policies and procedures of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 as amended (NEPA), and the regulation of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508. This regulation sets forth all FHWA, UMTA, and Department of Transportation (DOT) requirements under NEPA for the processing of highway and urban mass transportation projects. This regulation also sets forth procedures to comply with 23 U.S.C. 109(h), 128, 138, and 49

U.S.C. 303, 1602(d), 1604(h), 1604(i), 1607a, 1607a-1 and 1610.

§ 771.103 [Reserved]

§ 771.105 Policy.

It is the policy of the Administration that:

(a) To the fullest extent possible, all environmental investigations, reviews, and consultations be coordinated as a single process, and compliance with all applicable environmental requirements be reflected in the environmental document required by this regulation.¹

(b) Alternative courses of action be evaluated and decisions be made in the best overall public interest based upon a balanced consideration of the need for safe and efficient transportation; of the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the proposed transportation improvements; and of national, State, and local environmental protection goals.

(c) Public involvement and a systematic interdisciplinary approach be essential parts of the development process for proposed actions.

(d) Measures necessary to mitigate adverse impacts be incorporated into the action. Measures necessary to mitigate adverse impacts are eligible for Federal funding when the Administration determines that:

(1) The impacts for which the mitigation is proposed actually result from the Administration action; and

(2) The proposed mitigation represents a reasonable public expenditure after considering the impacts of the action and the benefits of the proposed mitigation measures. In making this determination, the Administration will consider, among other factors, the extent to which the proposed measures would assist in complying with a Federal statute, Executive Order, or

¹ FHWA and UMTA have supplementary guidance on the format and content of NEPA documents for their programs. This includes a list of various environmental laws, regulations, and Executive orders which may be applicable to projects. The FHWA Technical Advisory T6640.8A, October 30, 1987, and the UMTA supplementary guidance are available from the respective FHWA and UMTA headquarters and field offices as prescribed in 49 CFR part 7, Appendices D and G.

Administration regulation or policy.

(e) Costs incurred by the applicant for the preparation of environmental documents requested by the Administration be eligible for Federal assistance.

(f) No person, because of handicap, age, race, color, sex, or national origin, be excluded from participating in, or denied benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any Administration program or procedural activity required by or developed pursuant to this regulation.

[52 FR 32660, Aug. 28, 1987; 53 FR 11065, Apr. 5, 1988]

§ 771.107 Definitions.

The definitions contained in the CEQ regulation and in Titles 23 and 49 of the United States Code are applicable. In addition, the following definitions apply.

(a) *Environmental studies.* The investigations of potential environmental impacts to determine the environmental process to be followed and to assist in the preparation of the environmental document.

(b) *Action.* A highway or transit project proposed for FHWA or UMTA funding. It also includes activities such as joint and multiple use permits, changes in access control, etc., which may or may not involve a commitment of Federal funds.

(c) *Administration action.* The approval by FHWA or UMTA of the applicant's request for Federal funds for construction. It also includes approval of activities such as joint and multiple use permits, changes in access control, etc., which may or may not involve a commitment of Federal funds.

(d) *Administration.* FHWA or UMTA, whichever is the designated lead agency for the proposed action.

(e) *Section 4(f).* Refers to 49 U.S.C. 303 and 23 U.S.C. 138.²

² Section 4(f), which protected certain public lands and all historic sites, technically was repealed in 1983 when it was codified, without substantive change, as

§ 771.109 Applicability and responsibilities.

(a)(1) The provisions of this regulation and the CEQ regulation apply to actions where the Administration exercises sufficient control to condition the permit or project approval. Actions taken by the applicant which do not require Federal approvals, such as preparation of a regional transportation plan are not subject to this regulation.

(2) This regulation does not apply to or alter approvals by the Administration made prior to the effective date of this regulation

(3) Environmental documents accepted or prepared by the Administration after the effective date of this regulation shall be developed in accordance with this regulation.

(b) It shall be the responsibility of the applicant, in cooperation with the Administration to implement those mitigation measures stated as commitments in the environmental documents prepared pursuant to this regulation. The FHWA will assure that this is accomplished as a part of its program management responsibilities that include reviews of designs, plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E), and construction inspections. The UMTA will assure implementation of committed mitigation measures through incorporation by reference in the grant agreement, followed by reviews of designs and construction inspections.

(c) The Administration, in cooperation with the applicant, has the responsibility to manage the preparation of the appropriate environmental document. The role of the applicant will be determined by the Administration accordance with the CEQ regulation:

(1) *Statewide agency.* If the applicant is a public agency that has statewide jurisdiction (for example, a State highway agency or a State department of transportation) or is a local unit of government acting through a statewide agency,

49 U.S.C. 303. This regulation continues to refer to section 4(f) because it would create needless confusion to do otherwise; the policies section 4(f) engendered are widely referred to as "section 4(f)" matters. A provision with the same meaning is found at 23 U.S.C. 138 and applies only to FHWA actions.

and meets the requirements of section 102(2)(D) of NEPA, the applicant may prepare the environmental impact statement (EIS) and other environmental documents with the Administration furnishing guidance, participating in the preparation, and independently evaluating the document. All FHWA applicants qualify under this paragraph.

(2) *Joint lead agency.* If the applicant is a public agency and is subject to State or local requirements comparable to NEPA, then the Administration and the applicant may prepare the EIS and other environmental documents as joint lead agencies. The applicant shall initially develop substantive portions of the environmental document, although the Administration will be responsible for its scope and content.

(3) *Cooperating agency.* Local public agencies with special expertise in the proposed action may be cooperating agencies in the preparation of an environmental document. An applicant for capital assistance under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (UMT Act), is presumed to be a cooperating agency if the conditions in paragraph (c) (1) or (2) of this section do not apply. During the environmental process, the Administration will determine the scope and content of the environmental document and will direct the applicant, acting as a cooperating agency, to develop information and prepare those portions of the document concerning which it has special expertise.

(4) *Other.* In all other cases, the role of the applicant is limited to providing environmental studies and commenting on environmental documents. All private institutions or firms are limited to this role.

§ 771.111 Early coordination, public involvement, and project development.

(a) Early coordination with appropriate agencies and the public aids in determining the type of environmental document an action requires, the scope of the document, the level of analysis, and related environmental requirements. This involves the exchange of information from the inception of a proposal for action to preparation of the environmental document.

Applicants intending to apply for funds should notify the Administration at the time that a project concept is identified. When requested, the Administration will advise the applicant, insofar as possible, of the probable class of action and related environmental laws and requirements and of the need for specific studies and findings which would normally be developed concurrently with the environmental document.

(b) The Administration will identify the probable class of action as soon as sufficient information is available to identify the probable impacts of the action. For UMTA, this is normally no later than the review of the transportation improvement program (TIP) and for FHWA, the approval of the 105 program (23 U.S.C. 105).

(c) When FHWA and UMTA are involved in the development of joint projects, or when FHWA or UMTA acts as a joint lead agency with another Federal agency, a mutually acceptable process will be established on a case-by-case basis.

(d) During the early coordination process, the Administration, in cooperation with the applicant, may request other agencies having special interest or expertise to become cooperating agencies. Agencies with jurisdiction by law must be requested to become cooperating agencies.

(e) Other States, and Federal lane management entities, that may be significantly affected by the action or by any of the alternatives shall be notified early and their views solicited by the applicant in cooperation with the Administration. The Administration will prepare a written evaluation of any significant unresolved issues and furnish it to the applicant for incorporation into the environmental assessment (EA) or draft EIS.

(f) In order to ensure meaningful evaluation of alternatives and to avoid commitments to transportation improvements before they are fully evaluated, the action evaluated in each EIS or finding of no significant impact (FONSI) shall:

(1) Connect logical termini and be of sufficient length to address environmental matters on a broad scope;

(2) Have independent utility or independent significance, i.e., be usable and be a reasonable expenditure even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made; and

(3) Not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements.

(g) For major transportation actions, the tiering of EISs as discussed in the CEQ regulation (40 CFR 1502.20) may be appropriate. The first tier EIS would focus on broad issues such as general location, mode choice, and area-wide air quality and land use implications of the major alternatives. The second tier would address site-specific details on project impacts, costs, and mitigation measures.

(h) For the Federal-aid highway program:

(1) Each State must have procedures approved by the FHWA to carry out a public involvement/public hearing program pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 128 and 40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508.

(2) State public involvement/public hearing procedures must provide for:

(i) Coordination of public involvement activities and public hearings with the entire NEPA process.

(ii) Early and continuing opportunities during project development for the public to be involved in the identification of social, economic, and environmental impacts, as well as impacts associated with relocation of individuals, groups, or institutions.

(iii) One or more public hearings or the opportunity for hearing(s) to be held by the State highway agency at a convenient time and place for any Federal-aid project which requires significant amounts of right-of-way, substantially changes the layout or functions of connecting roadways or of the facility being improved, has a substantial adverse impact on abutting property, otherwise has a significant social, economic, environmental or other effect, or for which the FHWA determines that a public hearing is in the public interest.

(iv) Reasonable notice to the public of either a public hearing or the opportunity for a public hearing. Such notice will indicate the availability of explanatory information. The notice shall also provide information required to comply with

public involvement requirements of other laws, Executive orders, and regulations.

(v) Explanation at the public hearing of the following information, as appropriate:

(A) The project's purpose, need, and consistency with the goals and objectives of any local urban planning,

(B) The project's alternatives, and major design features,

(C) The social, economic, environmental, and other impacts of the project,

(D) The relocation assistance program and the right-of-way acquisition process.

(E) The State highway agency's procedures for receiving both oral and written statements from the public.

(vi) Submission to the FHWA of a transcript of each public hearing and a certification that a required hearing or hearing opportunity was offered. The transcript will be accompanied by copies of all written statements from the public, both submitted at the public hearing or during an announced period after the public hearing.

(3) Based on the reevaluation of project environmental documents required by §771.129, the FHWA and the State highway agency will determine whether changes in the project or new information warrant additional public involvement.

(4) Approvals or acceptances of involvement/public hearing procedures prior to the publication date of this regulation remain valid.

(i) Applicants for capital assistance in the UMTA program achieve public participation on proposed projects by holding public hearings and seeking input from the public through the scoping process for environmental documents. For projects requiring EISs, a public hearing will be held during the circulation period of the draft EIS. For all other projects, an opportunity for public hearings will be afforded with adequate prior notice pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1602(d), 1604(i), 1607a(f) and 1607a-1(d), and such hearings will be held when anyone with a significant social, economic, or environmental

interest in the matter requests it. Any hearing on the action must be coordinated with the NEPA process to the fullest extent possible.

(j) Information on the UMTA environmental process may be obtained from: Director, Office of Planning Assistance, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Washington, DC 20590. Information on the FHWA environmental process may be obtained from: Director, Office of Environmental Policy, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC 20590.

§ 771.113 Timing of Administration activities.

(a) The Administration in cooperation with the applicant will perform the work necessary to complete a FONSI or an EIS and comply with other related environmental laws and regulations to the maximum extent possible during the NEPA process. This work includes environmental studies, related engineering studies, agency coordination and public involvement. However, final design activities, property acquisition (with the exception of hardship and protective buying, as defined in §771.117(d)), purchase of construction materials or rolling stock, or project construction shall not proceed until the following have been completed:

(1)(i) The action has been classified as a categorical exclusion (CE), or

(ii) A FONSI has been approved, or

(iii) A final EIS has been approved and available for the prescribed period of time and a record of decision has been signed;

(2) For actions proposed for FHWA funding, the FHWA Division Administrator has received and accepted the certifications and any required public hearing transcripts required by 23 U.S.C. 128;

(3) For activities proposed for FHWA funding, the programming requirements of 23 CFR part 450, subpart B, and 23 CFR part 630, subpart A, have been met.

(b) For FHWA, the completion of the requirements set forth in paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section is considered acceptance of the general project location and concepts described in the environmental document unless otherwise specified by the approving official. However,

such approval does not commit the Administration to approve any future grant request to fund the preferred alternative.

(c) Letters of Intent issued under the authority of section 3(a)(4) of the UMT Act are used by UMTA to indicate an intention to obligate future funds for multi-year capital transit projects. Letters of Intent will not be issued by UMTA until the NEPA process is completed.

[52 FR 32660, Aug. 28, 1987; 53 FR 11066, Apr. 5, 1988]

§ 771.115 Classes of actions.

There are three classes of actions which prescribe the level of documentation required in the NEPA process.

(a) *Class I (EISs)*. Actions that significantly affect the environment require an EIS (40 CFR 1508.27). The following are examples of actions that normally required an EIS:

(1) A new controlled access freeway.

(2) A highway project of four or more lanes on a new location.

(3) New construction or extension of fixed rail transit facilities (e.g., rapid rail, light rail, commuter rail, automated guideway transit).

(4) New construction or extension of a separate roadway for buses or high occupancy vehicles not located within an existing highway facility.

(b) *Class II (CEs)*. Actions that do not individually or cumulative have a significant environmental effect are excluded from the requirement to prepare an EA or EIS. A specific list of CEs normally not requiring NEPA documentation is set forth in §771.117(c). When appropriately documented, additional projects may also qualify as CEs pursuant to §771.117(d).

(c) *Class III (EAs)*. Actions in which the significance of the environmental impact is not clearly established. All actions that are not Class I or II are Class III. All actions in this class require the preparation of an EA to determine the appropriate environmental document required.

§ 771.117 Categorical exclusions.

(a) Categorical exclusions (CEs) are actions which meet the definition contained in 40 CFR 1508.4, and, based on past experience with similar actions, do not involve significant environmental impacts. They are actions which: do not induce significant impacts to planned growth or land use for the area; do not require the relocation of significant numbers of people; do not have a significant impact on any natural, cultural, recreational, historic or other resource; do not involve significant air, noise, or water quality impacts; do not have significant impacts on travel patterns; or do not otherwise, either individually or cumulatively, have any significant environmental impacts.

(b) Any action which normally would be classified as a CE but could involve unusual circumstances will require the Administration, in cooperation with the applicant, to conduct appropriate environmental studies to determine if the CE classification is proper. Such unusual circumstances include:

- (1) Significant environmental impacts;
- (2) Substantial controversy on environmental grounds;
- (3) Significant impact on properties protected by section 4(f) of the DOT Act or section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; or
- (4) Inconsistencies with any Federal, State, or local law, requirement or administrative determination relating to the environmental aspects of the action.

(c) The following actions meet the criteria for CEs in the CEQ regulation (section 1508.4) and §771.117(a) of this regulation and normally do not require any further NEPA approvals by the Administration:

- (1) Activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as planning and technical studies; grants for training and research programs; research activities as defined in 23 U.S.C. 307; approval of a unified work program and any findings required in the planning process pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 134; approval of statewide programs under 23 CFR part 630; approval of project concepts under 23 CFR part 476;

engineering to define the elements of a proposed action or alternatives so that social, economic, and environmental effects can be assessed; and Federal-aid system revisions which establish classes of highways on the Federal-aid highway system.

- (2) Approval of utility installations along or across a transportation facility.

- (3) Construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities.

- (4) Activities included in the State's *highway safety plan* under 23 U.S.C. 402.

- (5) Transfer of Federal lands pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 317 when the subsequent action is not an FHWA action.

- (6) The installation of noise barriers or alterations to existing publicly owned buildings to provide for noise reduction.

- (7) Landscaping.

- (8) Installation of fencing, signs, pavement markings, small passenger shelters, traffic signals, and railroad warning devices where no substantial land acquisition or traffic disruption will occur.

- (9) Emergency repairs under 23 U.S.C. 125.

- (10) Acquisition of scenic easements.

- (11) Determination of payback under 23 CFR part 480 for property previously acquired with Federal-aid participation.

- (12) Improvements to existing rest areas and truck weigh stations.

- (13) Ridesharing activities.

- (14) Bus and rail car rehabilitation.

- (15) Alterations to facilities or vehicles in order to make them accessible for elderly and handicapped persons.

- (16) Program administration, technical assistance activities, and operating assistance to transit authorities to continue existing service or increase service to meet routine changes in demand.

- (17) The purchase of vehicles by the applicant where the use of these vehicles can be accommodated by existing facilities or by new facilities which themselves are within a CE.

- (18) Track and railbed maintenance and improvements when carried out within the existing right-of-way.

(19) Purchase and installation of operating or maintenance equipment to be located within the transit facility and with no significant impacts off the site.

(20) Promulgation of rules, regulations and directives.

(d) Additional actions which meet the criteria for a CE in the CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1508.4) and paragraph (a) of this section may be designated as CEs only after Administration approval. The applicant shall submit documentation which demonstrates that the specific conditions or criteria for these CEs are satisfied and that significant environmental effects will not result. Examples of such actions include but are not limited to:

(1) Modernization of a highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes (e.g., parking, weaving, turning, climbing).

(2) Highway safety or traffic operations improvement projects including the installation of ramp metering control devices and lighting.

(3) Bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction or replacement or the construction of grade separation to replace existing at-grade railroad crossings.

(4) Transportation corridor fringe parking facilities.

(5) Construction of new truck weigh stations or rest areas.

(6) Approvals for disposal of excess right-of-way or for joint or limited use of right-of-way, where the proposed use does not have significant adverse impacts.

(7) Approvals for changes in access control.

(8) Construction of new bus storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning and located on or near a street with adequate capacity to handle anticipated bus and support vehicle traffic.

(9) Rehabilitation or reconstruction of existing rail and bus buildings and ancillary facilities where only minor amounts of additional land are required and there is not a substantial increase in the number of users.

(10) Construction of bus transfer facilities (an open area consisting of passenger shelters,

boarding areas, kiosks and related street improvements) when located in a commercial area or other high activity center in which there is adequate street capacity for projected bus traffic.

(11) Construction of rail storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning and where there is no significant noise impact on the surrounding community.

(12) Acquisition of land for hardship or protective purposes; advance land acquisition loads under section 3(b) of the UMT Act.³ Hardship and protective buying will be permitted only for particular parcel or a limited number of parcels. These types of land acquisition qualify for a CE only where the acquisition will not limit the evaluation of alternatives, including shifts in alignment for planned construction projects, which may be required in the NEPA process. No project development on such land may proceed until the NEPA process has been completed.

(e) Where a pattern emerges of granting CE status for a particular type of action, the Administration will initiate rulemaking proposing to add this type of action to the list of categorical exclusions in paragraph (c) or (d) of this section, as appropriate.

[52 FR 32660, Aug. 28, 1987; 53 FR 11066, Apr. 5, 1988]

³ Hardship acquisition is early acquisition of property by the applicant at the property owner's request to alleviate particular hardship to the owner, in contrast to others, because of an inability to sell his property. This is justified when the property owner can document on the basis of health, safety or financial reasons that remaining in the property poses an undue hardship compared to others.

Protective acquisition is done to prevent imminent development of a parcel which is needed for a proposed transportation corridor or site. Documentation must clearly demonstrate that development of the land would preclude future transportation use and that such development is imminent. Advance acquisition is not permitted for the sole purpose of reducing the cost of property for a proposed project.

§ 771.119 Environmental assessments.

(a) An EA shall be prepared by the applicant in consultation with the Administration for each action that is not a CE and does not clearly require the preparation of an EIS, or where the Administration believes an EA would assist in determining the need for an EIS.

(b) For actions that require an EA, the applicant, in consultation with the Administration, shall, at the earliest appropriate time, begin consultation with interested agencies and others to advise them of the scope of the project and to achieve the following objectives: determine which aspects of the proposed action have potential for social, economic, or environmental impact; identify alternatives and measures which might mitigate adverse environmental impacts; and identify other environmental review and consultation requirements which should be performed concurrently with the EA. The applicant shall accomplish this through an early coordination process (i.e., procedures under §771.111) or through a scoping process. Public involvement shall be summarized and the results of agency coordination shall be included in the EA.

(c) The EA is subject to Administration approval before it is made available to the public as an Administration document. The UMTA applicants may circulate the EA prior to Administration approval provided that the document is clearly labeled as the applicant's document.

(d) The EA need not be circulated for comment but the document must be made available for public inspection at the applicant's office and at the appropriate Administration field offices in accordance with paragraphs (e) and (f) of this section. Notice of availability of the EA, briefly describing the action and its impacts, shall be sent by the applicant to the affected units of Federal, State and local government. Notice shall also be sent to the State intergovernmental review contacts established under Executive Order 12372.

(e) When a public hearing is held as part of the application for Federal funds, the EA shall be available at the public hearing and for a minimum of 15 days in advance of the public hearing. The

notice of the public hearing in local newspapers shall announce the availability of the EA and where it may be obtained or reviewed. Comments shall be submitted in writing to the applicant or the Administration with applicant or the Administration within 30 days of the availability of the EA unless the Administration determines, for good cause, that a different period is warranted. Public hearing requirements are as described in §771.111.

(f) When a public hearing is not held, the applicant shall place a notice in a newspaper(s) similar to a public hearing notice and at a similar stage of development of the action, advising the public of the availability of the EA and where information concerning the action may be obtained. The notice shall invite comments from all interested parties. Comments shall be submitted in writing to the applicant or the Administration within 30 days of the publication of the notice unless the Administration determines, for good cause, that a different period is warranted.

(g) If no significant impacts are identified, the applicant shall furnish the administration a copy of the revised EA, as appropriate; the public hearing transcript, where applicable; copies of any comments received and responses thereto; and recommend a FONSI. The EA should also document compliance, to the extent possible, with all applicable environmental laws and Executive orders, or provide reasonable assurance that their requirements can be met.

(h) When the Administration expects to issue a FONSI for an action described in §771.115(a), copies of the EA shall be made available for public review (including the affected units of government) for a minimum of 30 days before the Administration makes its final decision (See 40 CFR 1501.4(e)(2).) This public availability shall be announced by a notice similar to a public hearing notice.

(i) If, at any point in the EA process, the Administration determines that the action is likely to have a significant impact on the environment, the preparation of an EIS will be required.

§ 771.121 Findings of no significant impact.

(a) The Administration will review the EA and any public hearing comments and other comments received regarding the EA. If the Administration agrees with the applicant's recommendations pursuant to §771.119(g), it will make a separate written FONSI incorporating by reference the EA and any other appropriate environmental documents.

(b) After a FONSI has been made by the Administration, a notice of availability of the FONSI shall be sent by the applicant to the affected units of Federal, State and local government and the document shall be available from the applicant and the Administration upon request by the public. Notice shall also be sent to the State intergovernmental review contacts established under Executive Order 12372.

(c) If another Federal agency has issued a FONSI on an action which includes an element proposed for Administration funding, the Administration will evaluate the other agency's FONSI. If the Administration determines that this element of the project and its environmental impacts have been adequately identified and assessed, and concurs in the decision to issue a FONSI, the Administration will issue its own FONSI incorporating the other agency's FONSI. If environmental issues have not been adequately identified and assessed, the Administration will require appropriate environmental studies.

§ 771.123 Draft environmental impact statements.

(a) A draft EIS shall be prepared when the Administration determines that the action is likely to cause significant impacts on the environment. When the decision has been made by the Administration to prepare an EIS, the Administration will issue a Notice of Intent (40 CFR 1508.22) for publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Applications are encouraged to announce the intent to prepare an EIS by appropriate means at the local level.

(b) After publication of the Notice of Intent, the Administration, in cooperation with the applicant, will begin a scoping process. The scoping process will be used to identify the range

of alternatives and impacts and the significant issues to be addressed in the EIS and to achieve the other objectives of 40 CFR 1501.7. For FHWA, scoping is normally achieved through public and agency involvement procedures required by §771.111. For UMTA, scoping is achieved by soliciting agency and public responses to the action by letter or by holding scoping meetings. If a scoping meeting is to be held, it should be announced in the Administration's Notice of Intent and by appropriate means at the local level.

(c) The draft EIS shall be prepared by the Administration in cooperation with the applicant or, where permitted by law, by the applicant with appropriate guidance and participation by the Administration. The draft EIS shall evaluate all reasonable alternatives to the action and discuss the reasons why other alternatives, which may have been considered, were eliminated from detailed study. The draft EIS shall also summarize the studies, reviews, consultations, and coordination required by environmental laws or Executive orders to the extent appropriate at this stage in the environmental process.

(d) An applicant which is a *statewide agency* may select a consultant to assist in the preparation of an EIS in accordance with applicable contracting procedures. Where the applicant is a *joint lead* or *cooperating agency*, the applicant may select a consultant, after coordination with the Administration to assure compliance with 40 CFR 1506.5(c). The Administration will select any such consultant for *other* applicants. (See §771.109(c) for definitions of these terms.)

(e) The Administration, when satisfied that the draft EIS complies with NEPA requirements, will approve the draft EIS for circulation by signing and dating the cover sheet.

(f) A lead, joint lead, or a cooperating agency shall be responsible for printing the EIS. The initial printing of the draft EIS shall be in sufficient quantity to meet requirements for copies which can reasonably be expected from agencies, organizations, and individuals. Normally, copies will be furnished free of charge.

However, with Administration concurrence, the party requesting the draft EIS may be charged a fee which is not more than the actual cost of reproducing the copy or may be directed to the nearest location where the statement may be reviewed.

(g) The draft EIS shall be circulated for comment by the applicant on behalf of the Administration. The draft EIS shall be made available to the public and transmitted to agencies for comment no later than the time the document is filed with the Environmental Protection Agency in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.9. The draft EIS shall be transmitted to:

(1) Public officials, interest groups, and members of the public known to have an interest in the proposed action or the draft EIS;

(2) Federal, State and local governmental agencies expected to have jurisdiction or responsibility over, or interest or expertise in, the action. Copies shall be provided directly to appropriate State and local agencies, and to the State intergovernmental review contacts established under Executive Order 12372; and

(3) States and Federal land management entities which may be significantly affected by the proposed action or any of the alternatives. These copies shall be accompanied by a request that such State or entity advise the Administration in writing of any disagreement with the evaluation of impacts in the statement. The Administration will furnish the comments received to the applicant along with a written assessment of any disagreements for incorporation into the final EIS.

(h) The UMTA requires a public hearing during the circulation period of all draft EISs. FHWA public hearing requirements are as described in §771.111(h). Whenever a public hearing is held, the draft EIS shall be available at the public hearing and for a minimum of 15 days in advance of the public hearing. The availability of the draft EIS shall be mentioned, and public comments requested, in any public hearing notice and at any public hearing presentation. If a public hearing on an action proposed for FHWA funding is not held, a notice shall be placed in a newspaper similar to a public hearing notice advising where the draft EIS is available for

review, how copies may be obtained, and where the comments should be sent.

(i) The FEDERAL REGISTER public availability notice (40 CFR 1506.10) shall establish a period of not less than 45 days for the return of comments on the draft EIS. The notice and the draft EIS transmittal letter shall identify where comments are to be sent.

(j) For UMTA funded major urban mass transportation investments, the applicant shall prepare a report identifying a locally preferred alternative at the conclusion of the Draft EIS circulation period. Approval may be given to begin preliminary engineering on the principal alternative(s) under consideration. During the course of such preliminary engineering, the applicant will refine project costs, effectiveness, and impact information with particular attention to alternative designs, operations, detailed location decisions and appropriate mitigation measures. These studies will be used to prepare the final EIS or, where appropriate, a supplemental draft EIS.

§ 771.125 Final environmental impact statements.

(a)(1) After circulation of a draft EIS and consideration of comments received, a final EIS shall be prepared by the Administration in cooperation with the applicant or, where permitted by law, by the applicant with appropriate guidance and participation by the Administration. The final EIS shall identify the preferred alternative and evaluate all reasonable alternatives considered. It shall also discuss substantive comments received on the draft EIS and responses thereto, summarize public involvement, and describe the mitigation measures that are to be incorporated into the proposed action. Mitigation measures presented as commitments in the final EIS will be incorporated into the project as specified in §771.109(b). The final EIS should also document compliance, to the extent possible, with all applicable environmental laws and Executive orders, or provide reasonable assurance that their requirements can be met.

(2) Every reasonable effort shall be made to resolve interagency disagreements on actions before processing the final EIS. If significant issues remain unresolved, the final EIS shall identify those issues and the consultations and other efforts made to resolve them.

(b) The final EIS will be reviewed for legal sufficiency prior to Administration approval.

(c) The Administration will indicate approval of the EIS for an action by signing and dating the cover page. Final EISs prepared for actions in the following categories will be submitted to the Administration's Headquarters for prior concurrence:

(1) Any action for which the Administration determines that the final EIS should be reviewed at the Headquarters office. This would typically occur when the Headquarters office determines that (i) additional coordination with other Federal, State or local governmental agencies is needed; (ii) the social, economic, or environmental impacts of the action may need to be more fully explored; (iii) the impacts of the proposed action are unusually great; (iv) major issues remain unresolved; or (v) the action involves national policy issues.

(2) Any action to which a Federal, State or local government agency has indicated opposition on environmental grounds (which has not been resolved to the written satisfaction of the objecting agency).

(3) Major urban mass transportation investments as defined by UMTA's policy on major investments (49 FR 21284; May 18, 1984).

(d) The signature of the UMTA approving official on the cover sheet also indicates compliance with section 14 of the UMT Act and fulfillment of the grant application requirements of sections 3(d)(1) and (2), 5(h), and 5(i) of the UMT Act.

(e) Approval of the final EIS is not an Administration Action (as defined in §771.107(c)) and does not commit the Administration to approve any future grant request to fund the preferred alternative.

(f) The initial printing of the final EIS shall be in sufficient quantity to meet the request for copies which can be reasonably expected from agencies, organizations, and individuals.

Normally, copies will be furnished free of charge. However, with Administration concurrence, the party requesting the final EIS may be charged a fee which is not more than the actual cost of reproducing the copy or may be directed to the nearest location where the statement may be reviewed.

(g) The final EIS shall be transmitted to any persons, organizations, or agencies that made substantive comments on the draft EIS or requested a copy, no later than the time the document is filed with EPA. In the case of lengthy documents, the agency may provide alternative circulation processes in accordance with 40 CFR 1502.19. The applicant shall also publish a notice of availability in local newspapers and make the final EIS available through the mechanism established pursuant to DOT Order 4600.13 which implements Executive Order 12372. When filed with EPA, the final EIS shall be available for public review at the applicant's offices and at appropriate Administration offices. A copy should also be made available for public review at institutions such as local government offices, libraries, and schools, as appropriate.

§ 771.127 Record of decision.

(a) The Administration will complete and sign a record of decision (ROD) no sooner than 30 days after publication of the final EIS notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER or 90 days after publication of a notice for the draft EIS, whichever is later. The ROD will present the basis for the decision as specified in 40 CFR 1505.2, summarize any mitigation measures that will be incorporated in the project and document any required section 4(f) approval in accordance with §771.135(1). Until any required ROD has been signed, no further approvals may be given except for administrative activities taken to secure further project funding and other activities consistent with 40 CFR 1506.1.

(b) If the Administration subsequently wishes to approve an alternative which was not identified as the preferred alternative but was

fully evaluated in the final EIS, or proposes to make substantial changes to the mitigation measures or findings discussed in the ROD, a revised ROD shall be subject to review by those Administration offices which reviewed the final EIS under §771.125(c). To the extent practicable, the approved revised ROD shall be provided to all persons, organizations, and agencies that received a copy of the final EIS pursuant to §771.125(g).

§ 771.129 Re-evaluations.

(a) A written evaluation of the draft EIS shall be prepared by the applicant in cooperation with the Administration if an acceptable final EIS is not submitted to the Administration within 3 years from the date of the draft EIS circulation. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine whether or not a supplement to the draft EIS or a new draft EIS is needed.

(b) A written evaluation of the final EIS will be required before further approvals may be granted if major steps to advance the action (e.g., authority to undertake final design, authority to acquire a significant portion of the right-of-way, or approval of the plans, specifications and estimates) have not occurred within three years after the approval of the final EIS, final EIS supplement, or the last major Administration approval or grant.

(c) After approval of the EIS, FONSI, or CE designation, the applicant shall consult with the Administration prior to requesting any major approvals or grants to establish whether or not the approved environmental document or CE designation remains valid for the requested Administration action. These consultations will be documented when determined necessary by the Administration.

[52 FR 32660, Aug. 28, 1987; 53 FR 11066, Apr. 5, 1988]

§ 771.130 Supplemental environmental impact statements.

(a) A draft EIS, final EIS, or supplemental EIS may be supplemented at any time. An EIS shall be supplemented whenever the Administra-

tion determines that:

(1) Changes to the proposed action would result in significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the EIS; or

(2) New information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearings on the proposed action or its impacts would result in significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the EIS.

(b) However, a supplemental EIS will not be necessary where:

(1) The changes to the proposed action, new information, or new circumstances result in a lessening of adverse environmental impacts evaluated in the EIS without causing other environmental impacts that are significant and were not evaluated in the EIS; or

(2) The Administration decides to approve an alternative fully evaluated in an approved final EIS but not identified as the preferred alternative. In such a case, a revised ROD shall be prepared and circulated in accordance with §771.127(b).

(c) Where the Administration is uncertain of the significance of the new impacts, the applicant will develop appropriate environmental studies or, if the Administration deems appropriate, an EA to assess the impacts of the changes, new information, or new circumstances. If, based upon the studies, the Administration determines that a supplemental EIS is not necessary, the Administration shall so indicate in the project file.

(d) A supplement is to be developed using the same process and format (i.e., draft EIS, final EIS, and ROD) as an original EIS, except that scoping is not required.

(e) A supplemental draft EIS may be necessary for UMTA major urban mass transportation investments if there is a substantial change in the level of detail on project impacts during project planning and development. The supplement will address site-specific impacts and refined cost estimates that have been developed since the original draft EIS.

(f) In some cases, a supplemental EIS may be required to address issues of limited scope, such as the extent of proposed mitigation or the

evaluation of location or design variations for a limited portion of the overall project. Where this is the case, the preparation of a supplemental EIS shall not necessarily:

- (1) Prevent the granting of new approvals;
- (2) Require the withdrawal of previous approvals; or
- (3) Require the suspension of project activities; for any activity not directly affected by the supplement. If the changes in question are of such magnitude to require a reassessment of the entire action, or more than a limited portion of the overall action, the Administration shall suspend any activities which would have an adverse environmental impact or limit the choice of reasonable alternatives, until the supplemental EIS is completed.

§ 771.131 Emergency action procedures.

Requests for deviations from the procedures in this regulation because of emergency circumstances (40 CFR 1506.11) shall be referred to the Administration's headquarters for evaluation and decision after consultation with CEQ.

§ 771.133 Compliance with other requirements.

The final EIS or FONSI should document compliance with requirements of all applicable environmental laws, Executive orders, and other related requirements. If full compliance is not possible by the time the final EIS or FONSI is prepared, the final EIS or FONSI should reflect consultation with the appropriate agencies and provide reasonable assurance that the requirements will be met. Approval of the environmental document constitutes adoption of any Administration findings and determinations that are contained therein. The FHWA approval of the appropriate NEPA document will constitute its finding of compliance with the report requirements of 23 U.S.C. 128.

§ 771.135 Section 4(f) (49 U.S.C. 303).

(a)(1) The Administration may not approve the use of land from a significant publicly owned public park, recreation area, or wildlife and

waterfowl refuge, or any significant historic site unless a determination is made that:

- (i) There is no feasible and prudent alternative to use of land from the property; and
- (ii) The action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use.

(2) Supporting information must demonstrate that there are unique problems or unusual factors involved in the use of alternatives that avoid these properties or that the cost, social, economic, and environmental impacts, or community disruption resulting from such alternatives reach extraordinary magnitudes.

(b) The Administration will determine the application of section 4(f). Any use of lands from a section 4(f) property shall be evaluated early in the development of the action when alternatives to the proposed action are under study.

(c) Consideration under section 4(f) is not required when the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over a park, recreation area or refuge determine that the entire site is not significant. In the absence of such a determination, the section 4(f) land will be presumed to be significant. The administration will review the significance determination to assure its reasonableness.

(d) Where Federal lands or other public land holdings (e.g., State forests) are administered under statutes permitting management for multiple uses, and, in fact, are managed for multiple uses, section 4(f) applies only to those portions of such lands which function for, or are designated in the plans of the administering agency as being for, significant park, recreation, or wildlife and waterfowl purposes. The determination as to which lands so function or are so designated, and the significance of those lands, shall be made by the officials having jurisdiction over the lands. The Administration will review this determination to assure its reasonableness. The determination of significance shall apply to the entire area of such park, recreation, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge sites.

(e) In determining the application of section 4(f) to historic sites, the Administration, in cooperation with the applicant, will consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and appropriate local officials to identify all properties on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). The section 4(f) requirements apply only to sites on or eligible for the National Register unless the Administration determines that the application of section 4(f) is otherwise appropriate.

(f) The Administration may determine that section 4(f) requirements do not apply to restoration, rehabilitation, or maintenance of transportation facilities that are on or eligible for the National Register when:

(1) Such work will not adversely affect the historic qualities of the facility that caused it to be on or eligible for the National Register, and

(2) The SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) have been consulted and have not objected to the Administration finding in paragraph (f)(1) of this section.

(g)(1) Section 4(f) applies to all archeological sites on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register, including those discovered during construction except as set forth in paragraph (g)(2) of this section. Where section 4(f) applies to archeological sites discovered during construction, the section 4(f) process will be expedited. In such cases, the evaluation of feasible and prudent alternatives will take account of the level of investment already made. The review process, including the consultation with other agencies, will be shortened as appropriate.

(2) Section 4(f) does not apply to archeological sites where the Administration, after consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP, determines that the archeological resource is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery and has minimal value for preservation in place. This exception applies both to situations where data recovery is undertaken or where the Administration decides, with agreement of the SHPO and, where applicable, the ACHP not to recover the resource.

(h) Designations of park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites are sometimes made and determina-

tions of significance changed late in the development of a proposed action. With the exception of the treatment of archeological resources in paragraph (g) of this section, the Administration may permit a project to proceed without consideration under section 4(f) if the property interest in the section 4(f) lands was acquired for transportation purposes prior to the designation or change in the determination of significance and if an adequate effort was made to identify properties protected by section 4(f) prior to acquisition,

(i) The evaluations of alternatives to avoid the use of section 4(f) land and of possible measures to minimize harm to such lands shall be developed by the applicant in cooperation with the Administration. This information should be presented in the draft EIS, EA, or, for a project classified as a CE in a separate document. The section 4(f) evaluation shall be provided for coordination and comment to the officials having jurisdiction over the section 4(f) property and to the Department of the Interior, and as appropriate to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. A minimum of 45 days shall be established by the Administration for receipt of comments. Uses of section 4(f) land covered by a programmatic section 4(f) evaluation shall be documented and coordinated as specified in the programmatic section 4(f) evaluation.

(j) When adequate support exists for a section 4(f) determination, the discussion in the final EIS, FONSI, or separate section 4(f) evaluation shall specifically address:

(1) The reasons why the alternatives to avoid a section 4(f) property are not feasible and prudent; and

(2) All measures which will be taken to minimize harm to the section 4(f) property.

(k) The final Section 4(f) evaluation will be reviewed for legal sufficiency.

(l) For actions processed with EISs, the Administration will make the section 4(f) approval either in its approval of the final EIS or in the ROD. Where the section 4(f) approval is

documented in the final EIS, the Administration will summarize the basis for its section 4(f) approval in the ROD. Actions requiring the use of section 4(f) property, and proposed to be processed with a FONSI or classified as a CE, shall not proceed until notified by the Administration of section 4(f) approval. For these actions, any required section 4(f) approval will be documented separately.

(m) Circulation of a separate section 4(f) evaluation will be required when:

(1) A proposed modification of the alignment or design would require the use of section 4(f) property after the CE, FONSI, draft EIS, or final EIS has been processed;

(2) The Administration determines, after processing the CE, FONSI, draft EIS, or final EIS that section 4(f) applies to a property;

(3) A proposed modification of the alignment, design, or measures to minimize harm (after the original section 4(f) approval) would result in a substantial increase in the amount of section 4(f) land used, a substantial increase in the adverse impacts to section 4(f) land, or a substantial reduction in mitigation measures; or

(4) Another agency is the lead agency for the NEPA process, unless another DOT element is preparing the section 4(f) evaluation.

(n) If the Administration determines under §771.135(m) or otherwise, that section 4(f) is applicable after the CE, FONSI, or final EIS has been processed, the decision to prepare and circulate a section 4(f) evaluation will not necessarily require the preparation of a new or supplemental environmental document. Where a separately circulated section 4(f) evaluation is prepared, such evaluation does not necessarily:

(1) Prevent the granting of new approvals;

(2) Require the withdrawal of previous approvals; or

(3) Require the suspension of project activities; for any activity not affected by the section 4(f) evaluation.

(o) An analysis required by section 4(f) may involve different levels of detail where the section 4(f) involvement is addressed in a tiered EIS.

(1) When the first-tier, broad-scale EIS is prepared, the detailed information necessary to

complete the section 4(f) evaluation may not be available at that stage in the development of the action. In such cases, an evaluation should be made on the potential impacts that a proposed action will have on section 4(f) land and whether those impacts could have a bearing on the decision to be made. A preliminary determination may be made at this time as to whether there are feasible and prudent locations or alternatives for the action to avoid the use of section 4(f) land. This preliminary determination shall consider all possible planning to minimize harm to the extent that the level of detail available at the first-tier EIS stage allows. It is recognized that such planning at this stage will normally be limited to ensuring that opportunities to minimize harm at subsequent stages in the development processes have not been precluded by decisions made at the first-tier stage. This preliminary determination is then incorporated into the first-tier EIS.

(2) A section 4(f) approval made when additional design details are available will include a determination that:

(i) The preliminary section 4(f) determination made pursuant to paragraph (o)(1) of this section is still valid; and

(ii) The criteria of paragraph (a) of this section have been met.

(p) *Use.* (1) Except as set forth in paragraphs (f), (g)(2), and (h) of this section, “use” (in paragraph (a)(1) of this section) occurs:

(i) When land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility;

(ii) When there is a temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the statute’s preservationist purposes as determined by the criteria in paragraph (p)(7) of this section; or

(iii) When there is a constructive use of land.

(2) Constructive use occurs when the transportation project does not incorporate land from a section 4(f) resource, but the project’s proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Substantial impairment

occurs only when the protected activities, features, or attributes of the resources are substantially diminished.

(3) The Administration is not required to determine that there is no constructive use. However, such a determination could be made at the discretion of the Administration.

(4) The Administration has reviewed the following situations and determined that a constructive use occurs when:

(i) The projected noise level increase attributable to the project substantially interferes with the use and enjoyment of a noise-sensitive facility of a resource protected by section 4(f), such as hearing the performances at an outdoor amphitheater, sleeping in the sleeping area of a campground, enjoyment of a historic site where a quiet setting is a generally recognized feature or attribute of the site's significance, or enjoyment of an urban park where serenity and quiet are significant attributes;

(ii) The proximity of the proposed project substantially impairs esthetic features or attributes of a resource protected by section 4(f), where such features or attributes are considered important contributing elements to the value of the resource. Examples of substantial impairment to visual or esthetic qualities would be the location of a proposed transportation facility in such proximity that it obstructs or eliminates the primary views of an architecturally significant historical building, or substantially detracts from the setting of a park or historic site which derives its value in substantial part due to its setting;

(iii) The project results in a restriction on access which substantially diminishes the utility of a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, or a historic site;

(iv) The vibration impact from operation of the project substantially impairs the use of a section 4(f) resource, such as projected vibration levels from a rail transit project that are great enough to affect the structural integrity of a historic building or substantially diminish the utility of the building; or

(v) The ecological intrusion of the project substantially diminishes the value of wildlife habitat in a wildlife or waterfowl refuge adjacent to the project or substantially interferes with the access to a wildlife or waterfowl refuge, when

such access is necessary for established wildlife migration or critical life cycle processes.

(5) The Administration has reviewed the following situations and determined that a constructive use does *not* occur when:

(i) Compliance with the requirements of section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR part 800 for proximity impacts of the proposed action, on a site listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, results in an agreement of "no effect" or "no adverse effect";

(ii) The projected traffic noise levels of the proposed highway project do not exceed the FHWA noise abatement criteria as contained in Table 1, 23 CFR part 772, or the projected operational noise levels of the proposed transit project do not exceed the noise impact criteria in the UMTA guidelines;

(iii) The projected noise levels exceed the relevant threshold in paragraph (p)(5)(ii) of this section because of high existing noise, but the increase in the projected noise levels if the proposed project is constructed, when compared with the projected noise levels if the project is not built, is barely perceptible (3 dBA or less);

(iv) There are proximity impacts to a section 4(f) resource, but a governmental agency's right-of-way acquisition, an applicant's adoption of project location, or the Administration approval of a final environmental document, established the location for a proposed transportation project before the designation, establishment, or change in the significance of the resource. However, if the age of an historic site is close to, but less than, 50 years at the time of the governmental agency's acquisition, adoption, or approval, and except for its age would be eligible for the National Register, and construction would begin after the site was eligible, then the site is considered a historic site eligible for the National Register;

(v) There are impacts to a proposed public park, recreation area, or wildlife refuge, but the proposed transportation project and the resource are concurrently planned or developed.

Examples of such concurrent planning or development include, but are not limited to:

(A) Designation or donation of property for the specific purpose of such concurrent development by the entity with jurisdiction or ownership of the property for both the potential transportation project and the section 4(f) resource, or

(B) Designation, donation, planning or development of property by two or more governmental agencies, with jurisdiction for the potential transportation project and the section 4(f) resource, in consultation with each other;

(vi) Overall (combined) proximity impacts caused by a proposed project do not substantially impair the activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under section 4(f);

(vii) Proximity impacts will be mitigated to a condition equivalent to, or better than, that which would occur under a no-build scenario;

(viii) Change in accessibility will not substantially diminish the utilization of the section 4(f) resource; or

(ix) Vibration levels from project construction activities are mitigated, through advance planning and monitoring of the activities, to levels that do not cause a substantial impairment of the section 4(f) resource.

(6) When a constructive use determination is made, it will be based, to the extent it reasonably can, upon the following:

(i) Identification of the current activities, features, or attributes of a resource qualified for protection under section 4(f) and which may be sensitive to proximity impacts;

(ii) An analyses of the proximity impacts of the proposed project on the section 4(f) resource. If any of the proximity impacts will be mitigated, only the net impact need be considered in this analysis. The analysis should also describe and consider the impacts which could reasonably be expected if the proposed project were not implemented, since such impacts should not be attributed to the proposed project;

(iii) Consultation, on the above identification and analysis, with the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, recreation area, refuge, or historic site.

(7) A temporary occupancy of land is so minimal that it does not constitute a use within

the meaning of section 4(f) when the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) Duration must be temporary, i.e., less than the time needed for construction of the project, and there should be no change in ownership of the land;

(ii) Scope of the work must be minor, i.e., both the nature and the magnitude of the changes to the section 4(f) resource are minimal;

(iii) There are not anticipated permanent adverse physical impacts, nor will there be interference with the activities or purposes of the resource, on either a temporary or permanent basis;

(iv) The land being used must be fully restored, i.e., the resource must be returned to a condition which is at least as good as that which existed prior to the project; and

(v) There must be documented agreement of the appropriate Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the resource regarding the above conditions.

[52 FR 32660, Aug. 28, 1987; 53 FR 11066, Apr. 5, 1988, as amended at 56 FR 13279, Apr. 1, 1991; 57 FR 12411, Apr. 10, 1992]

§ 771.137 International actions.

(a) The requirements of this part apply to:

(1) Administration actions significantly affecting the environment of a foreign nation not participating in the action or not otherwise involved in the action.

(2) Administration actions outside the U.S., its territories, and possessions which significantly affect natural resources of global importance designated for protection by the President or by international agreement.

(b) If communication with a foreign government concerning environmental studies or documentation is anticipated, the Administration shall coordinate such communication with the Department of State through the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Federal Highway Administration	
SUBJECT GUIDANCE FOR PREPARING AND PROCESSING ENVIRONMENTAL AND SECTION 4(F) DOCUMENT	FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A October 30, 1987

1. **PURPOSE**. To provide guidance to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) field offices and to project applicants on the preparation and processing of environmental and Section 4(f) documents.
2. **CANCELLATION**. Technical Advisory T 6640.8, "Guidance Material for the Preparation of Environmental Documents," dated February 24, 1982, is canceled effective on November 27, 1987.
3. **APPLICABILITY**.
 - a. This material is not regulatory. It has been developed to provide guidance for uniformity and consistency in the format, content and processing of the various environmental studies and documents pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 23 U.S.C. 109(h) and 23 U.S.C. 138 (Section 4(f) of the DOT Act) and the reporting requirements of 23 U.S.C. 128.
 - b. The guidance is limited to the format, content and processing of NEPA and Section 4(f) studies and documents. It should be used in combination with a knowledge and understanding of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), FHWA's Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR 771) and other environmental statutes and orders (see Appendix A).
 - c. This guidance should not be used until November 27, 1987, the effective date of the 1987 revisions to 23 CFR 771.

Ali F. Sevin
Director, Office of Environmental
Policy

Attachment

Distribution: Headquarters
Special: Regions
Divisions

OPI: HEV-11

GUIDANCE FOR PREPARING AND PROCESSING ENVIRONMENTAL
AND SECTION 4(F) DOCUMENTS

Background

An earlier edition of this advisory (dated February 24, 1982) placed major emphasis on environmental impact statements (EISs) and provided limited guidance on environmental assessments (EAs) and other environmental studies needed for a categorical exclusion (CE) determination or a finding of no significant impact (FONSI). The revised guidance gives expanded coverage to CE determinations, EAs, FONSI, EISs, supplemental EISs, reevaluations, and Section 4(f) evaluations. This material is not regulatory. It does, however, provide for uniformity and consistency in the documentation of CEs and the development of environmental and Section 4(f) documents.

The FHWA subscribes to the philosophy that the goal of the NEPA process is better decisions and not more documentation. Environmental documents should be concise, clear, and to the point and should be supported by evidence that the necessary analyses have been made. They should focus on the important impacts and issues with the less important areas only briefly discussed. The length of EAs should normally be less than 15 pages and EISs should normally be less than 150 pages for most proposed actions and not more than 300 pages for the most complex proposals. The use of technical reports for various subject areas would help reduce the size of the documents.

The FHWA considers the early coordination process to be a valuable tool in determining the scope of issues to be addressed and in identifying and focusing on the proposed action's important issues. This process normally entails the exchange of information with appropriate Federal, State and local agencies and the public from inception of the proposed action to preparation of the environmental document or to completion of environmental studies for applicable CEs. Formal scoping meetings may also be held where such meetings would assist in the preparation of the environmental document. The role of other agencies and other environmental review and consultation requirements should be established during scoping. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has issued several guidance publications on NEPA and its regulations as follows: (1) "Questions and Answers about the NEPA Regulations," March 30, 1981; (2) "Scoping Guidance," April 30, 1981; and (3) "Guidance Regarding NEPA Regulations," July 28, 1983. This nonregulatory guidance is used by FHWA in preparing and processing environmental documents. Copies of the CEQ guidance are available in the FHWA Office of Environmental Policy (HEV-11).

Note, highway agency (HA) is used throughout this document to refer to a State and local highway agency responsible for conducting environmental studies and preparing environmental documents and to FHWA's Office of Direct Federal Programs when that office acts in a similar capacity.

FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A
OCTOBER 30, 1987
ATTACHMENT

SECTION	SUBJECT	PAGE
I	Categorical Exclusion (CE).....	5
II	Environmental Assessment (EA).....	7
III	Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)	9
IV	Distribution of EAs and FONSI's	11
V	EIS -- Format and Content	12
	Cover Sheet	12
	Summary.....	13
	Table of Contents	14
	Purpose of and Need for Action	14
	Alternatives	15
	Affected Environment	17
	Environmental Consequences	18
	Land Use Impacts	19
	Farmland Impacts.....	20
	Social Impacts	20
	Relocation Impacts	21
	Economic Impacts	22
	Joint Development.....	23
	Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists	23
	Air Quality Impacts	23
	Noise Impacts.....	25
	Water Quality Impacts	25
	Permits.....	26
	Wetland Impacts.....	27
	Water Body Modification and Wildlife Impacts	28
	Floodplain Impacts	28
	Wild and Scenic Rivers	30
	Coastal Barriers.....	30
	Coastal Zone Impacts	30
	Threatened or Endangered Species.....	31
	Historic and Archeological Preservation	32
	Hazardous Waste Sites.....	33
	Visual Impacts	34
	Energy	34
	Construction Impacts.....	34
	Relationship of Local Short-term Uses vs. Long-term Productivity	35
	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	35
	List of Preparers	36

	List of Agencies, Organizations and Persons to Whom Copies of the Statement are Sent	36
	Comments and Coordination.....	36
	Index	37
	Appendices	37
VI	Options for Preparing Final EISs	37
VII	Distribution of EISs and Section 4(f) Evaluations.....	39
VIII	Record of Decision — Format and Content	41
IX	Section 4(f) Evaluations — Format and Content.....	42
X	Other Agency Statements.....	45
XI	Reevaluations.....	46
XII	Supplemental EISs.....	47
XIII	Appendices.....	48
	Appendix A: Environmental Laws, Authority and Related Statutes and Orders	
	Appendix B: Notice of Intent	

FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A
OCTOBER 30, 1987
ATTACHMENT

I. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CE)

Categorical exclusions are actions or activities which meet the definition in 23 CFR 771.117(a) and, based on FHWA's past experience, do not have significant environmental effects. The CEs are divided into two groups based on the action's potential for impacts. The level of documentation necessary for a particular CE depends on the group the action falls under as explained below.

A. Documentation of Applicability

The first group is a list of 20 categories of actions in 23 CFR 771.117(c) which experience has shown never or almost never cause significant environmental impacts. These categories are non-construction actions (e.g., planning, grants for training and research programs) or limited construction activities (e.g., pedestrian facilities, landscaping, fencing). These actions are automatically classified as CEs, and except where unusual circumstances are brought to FHWA's attention, do not require approval or documentation by FHWA. However, other environmental laws may still apply. For example, installation of traffic signals in a historic district may require compliance with Section 106, or a proposed noise barrier which would use land protected by Section 4(f) would require preparation of a Section 4(f) evaluation (23 CFR 771.135(i)). In most cases, information is available from planning and programming documents for the FHWA Division Office to determine the applicability of other environmental laws. However, any necessary documentation should be discussed and developed cooperatively by the highway agency (HA) and the FHWA.

The second group consists of actions with a higher potential for impacts than the first group, but due to minor environmental impacts still meets the criteria for categorical exclusions. In 23 CFR 771.117(d), the regulation lists examples of 12 actions which past experience has found appropriate for CE classification. However, the second group is not limited to these 12 examples. Other actions with a similar scope of work may qualify as CEs. For actions in this group, site location is often a key factor. Some of these actions on certain sites may involve unusual circumstances or result in significant adverse environmental impacts. Because of the potential for impacts, these actions require some information to be provided by the HA so that the FHWA can determine if the CE classification is proper (23 CFR 771.117(d)). The level of information to be provided should be commensurate with the action's potential for adverse environmental impacts. Where adverse environmental impacts are likely to occur, the level of analysis should be sufficient to define the extent of impacts, identify appropriate mitigation measures, and address known and foreseeable public and agency concerns. As a minimum, the information should include a description of the proposed action and, as appropriate, its immediate surrounding area, a discussion of any specific areas of environmental concern (e.g., Section 4(f), wetlands, relocations), and a list of other Federal actions required, if any, for the proposal.

The documentation of the decision to advance an action in the second group as a CE can be accomplished by one of the following methods:

(1) Minor actions from the list of examples:

Minor construction projects or approval actions need only minimum documentation. Where project-specific information for such minor construction projects is included with the Section 105 program and clearly shows that the project is one of the 12 listed examples in Section 771.117(d), the approval of the Section 105 program can be used to approve the projects as CEs. Similarly, the three approval actions on the list (examples (6), (7) and (12)) should not normally require detailed documentation, and the CE determination can be documented as a part of the approval action being requested.

(2) Other actions from the list of examples:

For more complex actions, additional information and possibly environmental studies will be needed. This information should be furnished to the FHWA on a case-by-case basis for concurrence in the CE determination.

(3) Actions not on the list of examples:

Any action which meets the CE criteria in 23 CFR 771.117(a) may be classified as a CE even though it does not appear on the list of examples in Section 771.117(d). The actions on the list should be used as a guide to identify other actions that may be processed as CEs. The documentation to be submitted to the FHWA must demonstrate that the CE criteria are satisfied and that the proposed project will not result in significant environmental impacts. The classification decision should be documented as a part of the individual project submissions.

B. Consideration of Unusual Circumstances

Section 771.117(b) lists those unusual circumstances where further environmental studies will be necessary to determine the appropriateness of a CE classification. Unusual circumstances can arise on any project normally advanced with a CE; however, the type and depth of additional studies will vary with the type of CE and the facts and circumstances of each situation. For those actions on the fixed list (first group) of CEs, unusual circumstances should rarely, if ever, occur due to the limited scope of work. Unless unusual circumstances come to the attention of the HA or FHWA, they need not be given further consideration. For actions in the second group of CEs, unusual circumstances should be addressed in the information provided to the FHWA with the request for CE approval. The level of consideration, analysis, and documentation should be commensurate with the action's potential for significant impacts, controversy, or inconsistency with other agencies' environmental requirements.

When an action may involve unusual circumstances, sufficient early coordination, public involvement and environmental studies should be undertaken to determine the likelihood of significant impacts. If no significant impacts are likely to occur, the result of environmental studies and any agency and public involvement should adequately support such a conclusion and be included in the request to the FHWA for CE approval. If significant impacts are likely to occur, an

EIS must be prepared (23 CFR 771.123(a)). If the likelihood of significant impacts is uncertain even after studies have been undertaken, the HA should consult with the FHWA to determine whether to prepare an EA or an EIS.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

The primary purpose of an EA is to help the FHWA and HA decide whether or not an EIS is needed. Therefore, the EA should address only those resources or features which the FHWA and the HA decide will have a likelihood for being significantly impacted. The EA should be a concise document and should not contain long descriptions or detailed information which may have been gathered or analyses which may have been conducted for the proposed action. Although the regulations do not set page limits, CEQ recommends that the length of EAs usually be less than 15 pages. To minimize volume, the EA should use good quality maps and exhibits and incorporate by reference and summarize background data and technical analyses to support the concise discussions of the alternatives and their impacts.

The following format and content is suggested:

A. Cover Sheet

There is no required format for the EA. However, the EIS cover sheet format, as shown in Section V, is recommended as a guide. A document number is not necessary. The due date for comments should be omitted unless the EA is distributed for comments.

B. Purpose of and Need for Action

Describe the locations, length, termini, proposed improvements, etc. Identify and describe the transportation or other needs which the proposed action is intended to satisfy (e.g., provide system continuity, alleviate traffic congestion, and correct safety or roadway deficiencies). In many cases the project need can be adequately explained in one or two paragraphs. On projects where a law, Executive Order or regulation (e.g., Section 4(f), Executive Order 11990 or Executive Order 11988) mandates an evaluation of avoidance alternatives, the explanation of the project need should be more specific so that avoidance alternatives that do not meet the stated project need can be readily dismissed.

C. Alternatives

Discuss alternatives to the proposed action, including the no-action alternative, which are being considered. The EA may either discuss (1) the preferred alternative and identify any other alternatives considered or (2) if the applicant has not identified a preferred alternative, the alternatives under consideration. The EA does not need to evaluate in detail all reasonable alternatives for the project, and may be prepared for one or more build alternatives.

D. Impacts

For each alternative being considered, discuss any social, economic, and environmental impacts whose significance is uncertain. The level of analysis should be sufficient to adequately identify the impacts and appropriate mitigation measures, and address known and foreseeable public and agency concerns. Describe why these impacts are considered not significant. Identified impact areas which do not have a reasonable possibility for individual or cumulative significant environmental impacts need not be discussed.

E. Comments and Coordination

Describe the early and continuing coordination efforts, summarize the key issues and pertinent information received from the public and government agencies through these efforts, and list the agencies and, as appropriate, members of the public consulted.

F. Appendices (if any).

The appendices should include only analytical information that substantiates an analysis which is important to the document (e.g., a biological assessment for threatened or endangered species). Other information should be referenced only (i.e., identify the material and briefly describe its contents).

G. Section 4(f) Evaluation (if any).

If the EA includes a Section 4(f) evaluation, the EA/Section 4(f) evaluation or, if prepared separately, the Section 4(f) evaluation by itself must be circulated to the appropriate agencies for Section 4(f) coordination (23 CFR 771.135(i)). Section VII provides specific details on distribution and coordination of Section 4(f) evaluations. Section IX provides information on format and content of Section 4(f) evaluation.

If a programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation is used on the proposed project, this fact should be included and the Section 4(f) resource identified in the EA. The avoidance alternatives evaluation called for in Section 771.135(i) need not be repeated in the EA. Such evaluation would be part of the documentation to support the applicability and findings of the programmatic document.

H. EA Revisions.

Following the public availability period, the EA should be revised or an attachment provided, as appropriate, to (1) reflect changes in the proposed action or mitigation measures resulting from comments received on the EA or at the public hearing (if one is held) and any impacts of the changes, (2) include any necessary findings, agreements, or determination (e.g., wetlands, Section 106, Section 4(f) required for the proposal, and (3) include a copy of pertinent comments received on the EA and appropriate responses to the comments.

III. FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS (FONSI)

The EA, revised or with attachment(s) (see paragraph above) is submitted by the HA to the FHWA along with (1) a copy of the public hearing transcript, when one is held, (2) a recommendation of the preferred alternative, and (3) a request that a finding of no significant impact be made. The basis for the HA's finding of no significant impact request should be adequately documented in the EA and any attachment(s).

After review of the EA and any other appropriate information, the FHWA may determine that the proposed action has no significant impacts. This is documented by attaching to the EA a separate statement (sample follows) which clearly sets forth the FHWA conclusions. If necessary, the FHWA may expand the sample FONSI to identify the basis for the decision, uses of land from Section 4(f) properties, wetland findings, etc.

The EA or FONSI should document compliance with NEPA and other applicable environmental laws, Executive Orders, and related requirements. If full compliance with these other requirements is not possible by the time the FONSI is prepared, the documents should reflect consultation with the appropriate agencies and describe when and how the requirements will be met. For example, any action requiring the use of Section 4(f) property cannot proceed until FHWA gives a Section 4(f) approval (49 U.S.C. 303(c)).

(SAMPLE)

**FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR
(Title of Proposed Action)**

The FHWA has determined that alternative (identify the alternative selected) will have no significant impact on the human environment. This FONSI is based on the attached EA (reference other environmental and non-environmental documents as appropriate) which has been independently evaluated by the FHWA and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project and appropriate mitigation measures. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an EIS is not required. The FHWA takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope, and content of the attached EA (and other documents as appropriate).

Date

For FHWA

IV. DISTRIBUTION OF EAs AND FONSIs

A. Environmental Assessment

After clearance by FHWA, EAs must be made available for public inspection at the HA and FHWA Division offices (23 CFR 771.119(d)). Although only a notice of availability of the EA is required, the HA is encouraged to distribute a copy of the document with the notice to Federal, State and local government agencies likely to have an interest in the undertaking and to the State intergovernmental review contacts. The HA should also distribute the EA to any Federal, State or local agency known to have interest or special expertise (e.g. EPA for wetlands, water quality, air, noise, etc.) in those areas addressed in the EA which have or may have had potential for significant impact. The possible impacts and the agencies involved should be identified following the early coordination process. Where an individual permit would be required from the Corps of Engineers (COE) (i.e., Section 404 or Section 10) or from the Coast Guard (CG) (i.e., Section 9), a copy of the EA should be distributed to the involved agency in accordance with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)/Corps of Engineers Memorandum of Agreement or the FHWA/U.S. Coast Guard Memorandum of Understanding, respectively. Any internal FHWA distribution will be determined by the Division Office on a case-by-case basis.

B. Finding of No Significant Impact

Formal distribution of a FONSI is not required. The HA must send a notice of availability of the FONSI to Federal, State and local government agencies likely to have an interest in the undertaking and the State intergovernmental review contacts (23 CFR 771.121(b)). However, it is encouraged that agencies which commented on the EA (or requested to be informed) be advised of the project decision and the disposition of their comments and be provided a copy of the FONSI. This fosters good lines of communication and enhances interagency coordination.

V. Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) — FORMAT AND CONTENT

A. Cover Sheet

Each EIS should have a cover sheet containing the following information:

(EIS NUMBER)	
<u>Route, Termini, City or County, and State</u>	
Draft (Final) (Supplement)	
Environmental Impact Statement	
Submitted Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2) (c)	
(and where applicable, 49 U.S.C. 303) by the	
U.S. Department of Transportation	
Federal Highway Administration	
and	
State Highway Agency	
and	
(As applicable, any other joint lead agency)	
<u>Cooperating Agencies</u>	
(Include List Here, as applicable)	
Date of Approval	For (State Highway Agency)
Date of Approval	For FHWA
The following persons may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:	
(Name, address, and telephone number of FHWA Division Office contact)	(Name, address, and telephone number of HA contact)
A one-paragraph abstract of the statement.	
Comments on this draft EIS are due by (date) and should be sent to (name and address).	

The top left-hand corner of the cover sheet of all draft final and supplemental EISs contains an identification number. The following is an example:

FHWA-AZ-EIS-87-01-D(F)(S)

FHWA	-	name of Federal agency
AZ	-	name of State (cannot exceed four characters)
EIS	-	environmental impact statement
87	-	year draft statement was prepared
01	-	sequential number of draft statement for each calendar year
D	-	designates the statement as the draft statement
F	-	designates the statement as the final statement
S	-	designates supplemental statement and should be combined with draft (DS) or final (FS) statement designation. The year and sequential number will be the same as those used for the original draft EIS.

The EIS should be printed on 8-1/2 x 11-inch paper with any foldout sheets folded to that size. The wider sheets should be 8-1/2 inches high and should open to the right with the title or identification on the right. The standard size is needed for administrative recordkeeping.

B. Summary

The summary should include:

- (1) A brief description of the proposed FHWA action indicating route, termini, type of improvement, number of lanes, length, county, city, State, and other information, as appropriate.
- (2) A description of any major actions proposed by other governmental agencies in the same geographic area as the proposed FHWA action.
- (3) A summary of all reasonable alternatives considered. (The draft EIS must identify the preferred alternative or alternatives officially identified by the HA (40 CFR 1502.14(e)). The final EIS must identify the preferred alternative and should discuss the basis for its selection (23 CFR 771.125(a)(1)).
- (4) A summary of major environmental impacts, both beneficial and adverse.

- (5) Any areas of controversy (including issues raised by agencies and the public).
- (6) Any major unresolved issues with other agencies.
- (7) A list of other Federal actions required for the proposed action (i.e., permit approvals, land transfer, Section 106 agreements, etc.).

C. Table of Contents

For consistency with CEQ regulations, the following standard format should be used:

- (1) Cover Sheet
- (2) Summary
- (3) Table of Contents
- (4) Purpose of and Need for Action
- (5) Alternatives
- (6) Affected Environment
- (7) Environmental Consequences
- (8) List of Preparers
- (9) List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons to Whom Copies of the Statement are Sent
- (10) Comments and Coordination
- (11) Index
- (12) Appendices (if any)

D. Purpose of and Need for Action

Identify and describe the proposed action and the transportation problem(s) or other needs which it is intended to address (40 CFR 1502.13). This section should clearly demonstrate that a “need” exists and should define the “need” in terms understandable to the general public. This discussion should clearly describe the problems which the proposed action is to correct. It will form the basis for the “no action” discussion in the “Alternatives” section, and assist with the identification of reasonable alternatives and the selection of the preferred alternative. Charts, tables, maps and other illustrations (e.g., typical cross-section, photographs, etc.) are encouraged as useful presentation techniques.

The following is a list of items which may assist in the explanation of the need for the proposed action. It is by no means all-inclusive or applicable in every situation and is intended only as a guide:

- (1) Project Status — Briefly describe the project history including actions taken to date, other agencies and governmental units involved, actions pending, schedules, etc.
- (2) System Linkage — Is the proposed project a “connecting link?” How does it fit in the transportation system?
- (3) Capacity — Is the capacity of the present facility inadequate for the present traffic? Projected traffic? What capacity is needed? What is the level(s) of service for existing and proposed facilities?
- (4) Transportation Demand — Including relationship to any statewide plan or adopted urban transportation plan together with an explanation of the project's traffic forecasts that are substantially different from those estimates from the 23 U.S.C. 134 (Section 134) planning process.
- (5) Legislation — Is there a Federal, State, or local governmental mandate for the action.
- (6) Social Demands or Economic Development — New employment, schools, land use plans, recreation, etc. What projected economic development/land use changes indicate the need to improve or add to the highway capacity?
- (7) Modal Interrelationships — How will the proposed facility interface with and serve to complement airports, rail and port facilities, mass transit services, etc.?
- (8) Safety — Is the proposed project necessary to correct an existing or potential safety hazard? Is the existing accident rate excessively high? Why? How will the proposed project improve it.
- (9) Roadway Deficiencies — Is the proposed project necessary to correct existing roadway deficiencies (e.g., substantial geometrics, load limits on structures, inadequate cross-section, or high maintenance costs)? How will the proposed project improve it?

E. Alternatives

This section of the draft EIS must discuss a range of alternatives, including all “reasonable alternatives” under consideration and those “other alternatives” which were eliminated from detailed study (23 CFR 771.123(c)). The section should begin with a concise discussion of how and why the “reasonable alternatives” were selected for detailed study and explain why “other alternatives” were eliminated. The following range of alternatives should be considered when determining reasonable alternatives:

- (1) "No-action" alternative: The "no-action" alternative normally includes short-term minor restoration types of activities (safety and maintenance improvements, etc.) that maintain continuing operation of the existing roadway.
- (2) Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative: The TSM alternative includes those activities which maximize the efficiency of the present system. Possible subject areas to include in this alternative are options such as fringe parking, ride-sharing, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on existing roadways, and traffic signal timing optimization. This limited construction alternative is usually relevant only for major projects proposed in urbanized areas over 200,000 population.

For all major projects in these urbanized areas, HOV lanes should be considered. Consideration of this alternative may be accomplished by reference to the regional transportation plan, when that plan considers this option. Where a regional transportation plan does not reflect consideration of this option, it may be necessary to evaluate the feasibility of HOV lanes during early project development. Where a TSM alternative is identified as a reasonable alternative for a "connecting link" project, it should be evaluated to determine the effect that not building a highway link in the transportation plan will have on the remainder of the system. A similar analysis should be made where a TSM element(s) (e.g., HOV lanes) is part of a build alternative and reduces the scale of the highway link.

While the above discussion relates primarily to major projects in urbanized areas, the concept of achieving maximum utilization of existing facilities is equally important in rural areas. Before selecting an alternative on new location for major projects in rural areas, it is important to demonstrate that reconstruction and rehabilitation of the existing system will not adequately correct the identified deficiencies and meet the project need.

- (3) Mass Transit: This alternative includes those reasonable and feasible transit options (bus systems, rail, etc.) even though they may not be within the existing FHWA funding authority. It should be considered on all proposed major highway projects in urbanized areas over 200,000 population. Consideration of this alternative may be accomplished by reference to the regional or area transportation plan where that plan considers mass transit or by an independent analysis during early project development.

Where urban projects are multi-modal and are proposed for Federal funding, close coordination is necessary with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA). In these situations, UMTA should be consulted early in the project-development process. Where UMTA funds are likely to be requested for portions of the proposal, UMTA must be requested to be either a joint lead agency or a cooperating agency at the earliest stages of project development (23 CFR 771.111(d)). Where applicable, cost-effectiveness studies that have been performed should be summarized in the EIS.

- (4) Build alternatives: Both improvement of existing highway(s) and alternatives on new location should be evaluated. A representative number of reasonable alternatives must be presented and evaluated in detail in the draft EIS (40 CFR 1502.14(a)). For most major projects, there is a potential for a large number of reasonable alternatives. Where there is

a large number of alternatives, only a representative number of the most reasonable examples, covering the full range of alternatives, must be presented. The determination of the number of reasonable alternatives in the draft EIS, therefore, depends on the particular project and the facts and circumstances in each case.

Each alternative should be briefly described using maps or other visual aids such as photographs, drawings, or sketches to help explain the various alternatives. The material should provide a clear understanding of each alternative's termini, location, costs, and the project concept (number of lanes, right-of-way requirements, median width, access control, etc.). Where land has been or will be reserved or dedicated by local government(s), donated by individuals, or acquired through advanced or hardship acquisition for use as highway right-of-way for any alternative under consideration, the draft EIS should identify the status and extent of such property and the alternatives involved. Where such lands are reserved, the EIS should state that the reserved lands will not influence the alternative to be selected.

Development of more detailed design for some aspects (e.g., Section 4(f), COE or CG permits, noise, wetlands, etc.) of one or more alternatives may be necessary during preparation of the draft and final EIS in order to evaluate impacts or mitigation measures or to address issues raised by other agencies or the public. However, care should be taken to avoid unnecessarily specifying features which preclude cost-effective final design options.

All reasonable alternatives under consideration (including the no-build) need to be developed to a comparable level of detail in the draft EIS so that their comparative merits may be evaluated (40 CFR 1502.14(b) and (d)). In those situations where the HA has officially identified a "preferred" alternative based on its early coordination and environmental studies, the HA should so indicate in the draft EIS. In these instances, the draft EIS should include a statement indicating that the final selection of an alternative will not be made until the alternatives' impacts and comments on the draft EIS and from the public hearing (if held) have been fully evaluated. Where a preferred alternative has not been identified, the draft EIS should state that all reasonable alternatives are under consideration and that decision will be made after the alternatives' impacts and comments on the draft EIS and from the public hearing (if held) have been fully evaluated.

The final EIS must identify the preferred alternative and should discuss the basis for its selection (23 CFR 771.125(a)(1)). The discussion should provide the information and rationale identified in Section VIII (Record of Decision), paragraph (B). If the preferred alternative is modified after the draft EIS, the final EIS should clearly identify the changes and discuss the reasons why any new impacts are not significant.

F. Affected Environment

This section provides a concise description of the existing social, economic, and environmental setting for the area affected by all alternatives presented in the EIS. Where possible, the description should be a single description for the general project area rather than a separate one for each alternative. The general population served and/or affected (city, county, etc.) by the

proposed action should be identified by race, color, national origin, and age. Demographic data should be obtained from available secondary sources (e.g., census data, planning reports) unless more detailed information is necessary to address specific concerns. All socially, economically, and environmentally sensitive locations or features in the proposed project impact area (e.g., neighborhoods, elderly/minority/ethnic groups, parks, hazardous material sites, historic resources, wetlands, etc.) should be identified on exhibits and briefly described in the text. However, it may be desirable to exclude from environmental documents the specific location of archeological sites to prevent vandalism.

To reduce paperwork and eliminate extraneous background material, the discussion should be limited to data, information, issues, and values which will have a bearing on possible impacts, mitigation measures, and on the selection of an alternative. Data and analyses should be commensurate with the importance of the impact, with the less important material summarized or referenced rather than be reproduced. Photographs, illustrations, and other graphics should be used with the text to give a clear understanding of the area and the important issues. Other Federal activities which contribute to the significance of the proposed action's impacts should be described.

This section should also briefly describe the scope and status of the planning processes for the local jurisdictions and the project area. Maps of any adopted land use and transportation plans for these jurisdictions and the project area would be helpful in relating the proposed project to the planning processes.

G. Environmental Consequences

This section includes the probable beneficial and adverse social, economic and environmental effects of alternatives under consideration and describes the measures proposed to mitigate adverse impacts. The information should have sufficient scientific and analytical substance to provide a basis for evaluating the comparative merits of the alternatives. The discussion of the proposed project impacts should not use the term significant in describing the level of impacts. There is no benefit to be gained from its use. If the term significant is used, however, it should be consistent with the CEQ definition and be supported by factual information.

There are two principal ways of preparing this section. One is to discuss the impacts and mitigation measures separately for each alternative with the alternatives as headings. The second (which is advantageous where there are few alternatives or where impacts are similar for the various alternatives) is to present this section with the impacts as the headings. Where appropriate, a sub-section should be included which discusses the general impacts and mitigation measures that are the same for the various alternatives under consideration. This would reduce or eliminate repetition under each of the alternative discussions. Charts, tables, maps, and other graphics illustrating comparisons between the alternatives (e.g., costs, residential displacements, noise impacts, etc.) are useful as a presentation technique.

When preparing the final EIS, the impacts and mitigation measures of the alternatives, particularly the preferred alternative, may need to be discussed in more detail to elaborate on information, firm-up commitments or address issues raised following the draft EIS. The final EIS should also

identify any new impacts (and their significance) resulting from modification of or identification of substantive new circumstances or information regarding the preferred alternative following the draft EIS circulation. Note: Where new significant impacts are identified, a supplemental draft EIS is required (40 CFR 1502.9(c)).

The following information should be included in both the draft and final EIS for each reasonable alternative:

- (1) A summary of studies undertaken, any major assumptions made and supporting information on the validity of the methodology (where the methodology is not generally accepted as state-of-the-art).
- (2) Sufficient supporting information or results of analyses to establish the reasonableness of the conclusions on impacts.
- (3) A discussion of mitigation measures. These measures normally should be investigated in appropriate detail for each reasonable alternative so they can be identified in the draft EIS. The final EIS should identify, describe and analyze all proposed mitigation measures for the preferred alternative.

In addition to normal FHWA program monitoring of design and construction activities, special instances may arise when a formal program for monitoring impacts or implementation of mitigation measures will be appropriate. For example, monitoring ground or surface waters that are sources for drinking water supply; monitoring noise or vibration of nearby sensitive activities (e.g., hospitals, schools); or providing an on-site professional archeologist to monitor excavation activities in highly sensitive archeological areas. In these instances, the final EIS should describe the monitoring program.

- (4) A discussion, evaluation and resolution of important issues on each alternative. If important issues raised by other agencies on the preferred alternative remain unresolved, the final EIS must identify those issues and the consultations and other efforts made to resolve them (23 CFR 771.125(a)(2)).

Listed below are potentially significant impacts most commonly encountered by highway projects. These factors should be discussed for each reasonable alternative where a potential for impact exists. This list is not all-inclusive and, on specific projects, there may be other impact areas that should be included.

1. **Land Use Impacts**

This discussion should identify the current development trends and the State and/or local government plans and policies on land use and growth in the area which will be impacted by the proposed project.

These plans and policies are normally reflected in the area's comprehensive development plan, and include land use, transportation, public facilities, housing, community services, and other areas.

The land use discussion should assess the consistency of the alternatives with the comprehensive development plans adopted for the area and (if applicable) other plans used in the development of the transportation plan required by Section 134. The secondary social, economic, and environmental impacts of any substantial, foreseeable, induced development should be presented for each alternative, including adverse effects on existing communities. Where possible, the distribution between planned and unplanned growth should be identified.

2. Farmland Impacts

Farmland includes 1) prime, 2) unique, 3) other than prime or unique that is of statewide importance, and 4) other than prime or unique that is of local importance.

The draft EIS should summarize the results of early consultation with the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) and, as appropriate, State and local agriculture agencies where any of the four specified types of farmland could be directly or indirectly impacted by any alternative under consideration. Where farmland would be impacted, the draft EIS should contain a map showing the location of all farmlands in the project impact area, discuss the impacts of the various alternatives and identify measures to avoid or reduce the impacts. Form AD 1006 (Farmland Conversion Impact Rating) should be processed, as appropriate, and a copy included in the draft EIS. Where the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment score (from Form AD 1006) is 160 points or greater, the draft EIS should discuss alternatives to avoid farmland impacts.

If avoidance is not possible, measures to minimize or reduce the impacts should be evaluated and, where appropriate, included in the proposed action.

3. Social Impacts

Where there are foreseeable impacts, the draft EIS should discuss the following items for each alternative commensurate with the level of impacts and to the extent they are distinguishable:

- (a) Changes in the neighborhoods or community cohesion for the various social groups as a result of the proposed action. These changes may be beneficial or adverse and may include splitting neighborhoods, isolating a portion of a neighborhood or an ethnic group, generating new development, changing property values, separating residents from community facilities, etc.
- (b) Changes in travel patterns and accessibility (e.g., vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian).
- (c) Impacts on school districts, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc. This should include both the direct impacts to these entities and the indirect impacts resulting from the displacement of households and businesses.

- (d) Impacts of alternatives on highway and traffic safety as well as on overall public safety.
- (e) General social groups specially benefited or harmed by the proposed project. The effects of a project on the elderly, handicapped, nondrivers, transit-dependent and minority and ethnic groups are of particular concern and should be described to the extent these effects can be reasonably predicted. Where impacts on a minority or ethnic population are likely to be an important issue, the EIS should contain the following information broken down by race, color, and national origin: the population of the study area, the number of displaced residents, the type and number of displaced businesses, and an estimate of the number of displaced employees in each business sector. Changes in ethnic or minority employment opportunities should be discussed and the relationship of the project to other Federal actions which may serve or adversely affect the ethnic or minority population should be identified.

The discussion should address whether any social group is disproportionately impacted and identify possible mitigation measures to avoid or minimize any adverse impacts. Secondary sources of information such as census and personal contact with community leaders supplemented by visual inspections normally should be used to obtain the data for this analysis. However, for projects with major community impacts, a survey of the affected area may be needed to identify the extent and severity of impacts on these social groups.

4. Relocation Impacts

The relocation information should be summarized in sufficient detail to adequately explain the relocation situation including anticipated problems and proposed solutions. Project relocation documents from which information is summarized should be referenced in the draft EIS. Secondary sources of information such as census, economic reports and contact with community leaders, supplemented by visual inspections (and, as appropriate, contact with local officials) may be used to obtain the data for this analysis. Where a proposed project will result in displacements, the following information regarding households and businesses should be discussed for each alternative under consideration commensurate with the level of impact and to the extent they are likely to occur:

- (a) An estimate of the number of households to be displaced, including the family characteristics (e.g., minority, ethnic, handicapped, elderly, large family, income level, and owner/tenant status). However, where there are very few displacees, information on race, ethnicity and income levels should not be included in the EIS to protect the privacy of those affected.
- (b) A discussion comparing available (decent, safe, and sanitary) housing in the area with the housing needs of the displacees. The comparison should include (1) price ranges, (2) sizes (number of bedrooms), and (3) occupancy status (owner/tenant).

- (c) A discussion of any affected neighborhoods, public facilities, non-profit organizations, and families having special composition (e.g., ethnic, minority, elderly, handicapped, or other factors) which may require special relocation considerations and the measures proposed to resolve these relocation concerns.
- (d) A discussion of the measures to be taken where the existing housing inventory is insufficient, does not meet relocation standards, or is not within the financial capability of the displacees. A commitment to last resort housing should be included when sufficient comparable replacement housing may not be available.
- (e) An estimate of the numbers, descriptions, types of occupancy (owner/tenant), and sizes (number of employees) of businesses and farms to be displaced. Additionally, the discussion should identify (1) sites available in the area to which the affected businesses may relocate, (2) likelihood of such relocation, and (3) potential impacts on individual businesses and farms caused by displacement or proximity of the proposed highway if not displaced.
- (f) A discussion of the results of contracts, if any, with local governments, organizations, groups, and individuals regarding residential and business relocation impacts, including any measures or coordination needed to reduce general and/or specific impacts. These contacts are encouraged for projects with large numbers of relocatees or complex relocation requirements. Specific financial and incentive programs or opportunities (beyond those provided by the Uniform Relocation Act) to residential and business relocatees to minimize impacts may be identified, if available through other agencies or organizations.
- (g) A statement that (1) the acquisition and relocation program will be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and (2) relocation resources are available to all residential and business relocations without discrimination.

5. Economic Impacts

Where there are foreseeable economic impacts, the draft EIS should discuss the following for each alternative commensurate with the level of impacts:

- (a) The economic impacts on the regional and/or local economy such as the effects of the project on development, tax revenues and public expenditures, employment opportunities, accessibility, and retail sales. Where substantial impacts on the economic viability of affected municipalities are likely to occur, they should also be discussed together with a summary of any efforts undertaken and agreements reached for using the transportation investment to support both public and private economic development plans. To the extent possible, this discussion should rely upon results of coordination with and views of affected State, county, and city officials and upon studies performed under Section 134.

- (b) The impacts on the economic vitality of existing highway-related businesses (e.g., gasoline stations, motels, etc.) and the resultant impact, if any, on the local economy. For example, the loss of business or employment resulting from building an alternative on new location bypassing a local community.
- (c) Impacts of the proposed action on established business districts, and any opportunities to minimize or reduce such impacts by the public and/or private sectors. This concern is likely to occur on a project that might lead to or support new large commercial development outside of a central business district.

6. Joint Development

Where appropriate, the draft EIS should identify and discuss those joint development measures which will preserve or enhance an affected community's social, economic, environmental, and visual values. This discussion may be presented separately or combined with the land use and/or social impacts presentations. The benefits to be derived, those who will benefit (communities, social groups, etc.) and the entities responsible for maintaining the measures should be identified.

7. Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists

Where current pedestrian or bicycle facilities or indications of use are identified, the draft EIS should discuss the current and anticipated use of the facilities, the potential impacts of the affected alternatives, and proposed measures, if any, to avoid or reduce adverse impacts to the facility(ies) and its users. Where new facilities are proposed as a part of the proposed highway project, the EIS should include sufficient information to explain the basis for providing the facilities (e.g., proposed bicycle facility is a link in the local plan or sidewalks will reduce project access impact to the community). The final EIS should identify those facilities to be included in the preferred alternative. Where the preferred alternative would sever an existing major route for non-motorized transportation traffic, the proposed project needs to provide a reasonable alternative route or demonstrate that such a route exists (23 U.S.C. 109(n)). To the fullest extent possible, this needs to be described in the final EIS.

8. Air Quality Impacts

The draft EIS should contain a brief discussion of the transportation-related air quality concerns in the project area and a summary of the project-related carbon monoxide (CO) analysis if such analysis is performed. The following information should be presented, as appropriate:

- (a) Mesoscale Concerns: Ozone (O_3), Hydrocarbons (HC) and Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x) air quality concerns are regional in nature and as such meaningful evaluation on a project-by-project basis is not possible. Where these pollutants are an issue, the air quality emissions inventories in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) should be referenced and briefly summarized in the draft EIS. Further, the relationship of the project to the SIP should be described in the EIS by including one of the following statements:

(1) This project is in an area where the SIP does not contain any transportation control measures. Therefore, the conformity procedures of 23 CFR 770 do not apply to this project.

(2) This project is in an area which has transportation control measures in the SIP which was (conditionally) approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on (date). The FHWA has determined that both the transportation plan and the transportation improvement program conform to the SIP. The FHWA has determined that this project is included in the transportation improvement program for the (indicate 3C planning area). Therefore, pursuant to 23 CFR 770, this project conforms to the SIP.

Under certain circumstances, neither of these statements will precisely fit the situation and may need to be modified. Additionally, if the project is a Transportation Control Measure from the SIP, this should be highlighted to emphasize the project's air quality benefits.

- (b) Microscale Concerns: Carbon monoxide is a project-related concern and as such should be evaluated in the draft EIS. A microscale CO analysis is unnecessary where such impacts (project CO contribution plus background) can be judged to be well below the 1- and 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards (or other applicable State or local standards). This judgment may be based on (1) previous analyses for similar projects; (2) previous general analyses for various classes of projects; or (3) simplified graphical or "look-up" table evaluations. In these cases, a brief statement stating the basis for the judgment is sufficient.

For those projects where a microscale CO analysis is performed, each reasonable alternative should be analyzed for the estimated time of completion and design year. A brief summary of the methodologies and assumptions used should be included in the draft EIS. Lengthy discussions, if needed, should be included in a separate technical report and referenced in the EIS. Total CO concentrations (project contribution plus estimated background) at identified reasonable receptors for each alternative should be reported. A comparison should be made between alternatives and with applicable State and nation standards. Use of a table for this comparison is recommended for clarity.

As long as the total predicted 1-hour CO concentration is less than 9 ppm (the 8-hour CO standard), no separate 8-hour analysis is necessary. If the 1-hour CO concentration is greater than 9 ppm, an 8-hour analysis should be performed. Where the preferred alternative would result in violations of the 1 or 8-hour CO standards, an effort should be made to develop reasonable mitigation measures through early coordination between FHWA, EPA, and appropriate State and local highway and air quality agencies. The final EIS should discuss the proposed mitigation measures and include evidence of the coordination.

9. Noise Impacts

The draft EIS should contain a summary of the noise analysis including the following for each alternative under detailed study:

- (a) A brief description of noise sensitive areas (residences, businesses, schools, parks, etc.), including information on the number and types of activities which may be affected. This should include developed lands and undeveloped lands for which development is planned, designed, and programmed.
- (b) The extent of the impact (in decibels) at each sensitive area. This includes a comparison of the predicted noise levels with both the FHWA noise abatement criteria and the existing noise levels. (Traffic noise impacts occur when the predicted traffic noise levels approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria or when they substantially exceed the existing noise levels). Where there is a substantial increase in noise levels, the HA should identify the criterion used for defining "substantial increase." Use of a table for this comparison is recommended for clarity.
- (c) Noise abatement measures which have been considered for each impacted area and those measures that are reasonable and feasible and that would "likely" be incorporated into the proposed project. Estimated costs, decibel reductions and height and length of barriers should be shown for all abatement measures.

Where it is desirable to qualify the term "likely," the following statement or similar wording would be appropriate: "Based on the studies completed to date, the State intends to install noise abatement measures in the form of a barrier at (location(s)). These preliminary indications of likely abatement measures are based upon preliminary design for a barrier of _____ high and _____ long and a cost of \$_____ that will reduce the noise level by _____ dBA for _____ residences (businesses, schools, parks, etc.). (Where there is more than one barrier, provide information for each one.) If during final design these conditions substantially change, the abatement measures might not be provided. A final decision on the installation of abatement measure(s) will be made upon completion of the project design and the public involvement process."

- (d) Noise impacts for which no prudent solution is reasonably available and the reasons why.

10. Water Quality Impacts

The draft EIS should include summaries of analyses and consultations with the State and/or local agency responsible for water quality. Coordination with the EPA under the Federal Clean Water Act may also provide assistance in this area. The discussion should include sufficient information to describe the ambient conditions of streams and water bodies which are likely to be impacted and identify the potential impacts of each alternative and proposed mitigation measures. Under

normal circumstances, existing data may be used to describe ambient conditions. The inclusion of water quality data spanning several years is encouraged to reflect trends.

The draft EIS should also identify any locations where roadway runoff or other nonpoint source pollution may have an adverse impact on sensitive water resources such as water supply reservoirs, ground water recharge areas, and high quality streams. The 1981 FHWA research report entitled "Constituents of Highway Runoff," the 1985 report entitled "Management Practices for Mitigation of Highway Stormwater Runoff Pollution" and the 1987 report entitled "Effects of Highway Runoff on Receiving Waters" contain procedures for estimating pollutant loading from highway runoff and would be helpful in determining the level of potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. The draft EIS should identify the potential impacts of each alternative and proposed mitigation measures.

Where an area designated as principal or sole-source aquifer under Section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act may be impacted by a proposed project, early coordination with EPA will assist in identifying potential impacts. The EPA will furnish information on whether any of the alternatives affect the aquifer. This coordination should also identify any potential impacts to the critical aquifer protection area (CAPA), if designated, within affected sole-source aquifers. If none of the alternatives affect the aquifer, the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act are satisfied. If an alternative is selected which affects the aquifer, a design must be developed to assure, to the satisfaction of EPA, that it will not contaminate the aquifer (40 CFR 149). The draft EIS should document coordination with EPA and identify its position on the impacts of the various alternatives. The final EIS should show that EPA's concerns on the preferred alternative have been resolved.

Wellhead protection areas were authorized by the 1986 Amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act. Each State will develop State wellhead protection plans with final approval by EPA. When a proposed project encroaches on a wellhead protection area, the draft EIS should identify the area, the potential impact of each alternative and proposed mitigation measures. Coordination with the State agency responsible for the protection plan will aid in identifying the areas, impacts and mitigation. If the preferred alternative impacts these areas, the final EIS should document that it complies with the approved State wellhead protection plan.

11. Permits

If a facility such as a safety rest area is proposed and it will have a point source discharge, a Section 402 permit will be required for point source discharge (40 CFR 122). The draft EIS should discuss potential adverse impacts resulting from such proposed facilities and identify proposed mitigation measures. The need for a Section 402 permit and Section 401 water quality certification should be identified in the draft EIS.

For proposed actions requiring a Section 404 or Section 10 (Corps of Engineers) permit, the draft EIS should identify by alternative the general location of each dredge or fill activity, discuss the potential adverse impacts, identify proposed mitigation measures (if not addressed elsewhere in the draft EIS), and include evidence of coordination with the Corps of Engineers (in accordance with the U.S. DOT/Corps of Engineers Memorandum of Agreement) and appropriate Federal,

State and local resource agencies and State and local water quality agencies. Where the preferred alternative requires an individual Section 404 or Section 10 permit, the final EIS should identify for each permit activity the approximate quantities of dredge or fill material, general construction grades and proposed mitigation measures.

For proposed actions requiring Section 9 (U.S. Coast Guard bridge) permits, the draft EIS should identify by alternative the location of the permit activity, potential impacts to navigation and the environment (if not addressed elsewhere in the document), proposed mitigation measures and evidence of coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard (in accordance with the FHWA/U.S. Coast Guard Memorandum of Understanding). Where the preferred alternative requires a Section 9 permit, the final EIS should identify for each permit activity the proposed horizontal and vertical navigational clearances and include an exhibit showing the various dimensions.

For all permit activities, the final EIS should include evidence that every reasonable effort has been made to resolve the issues raised by other agencies regarding the permit activities. If important issues remain unresolved, the final EIS must identify those issues, the positions of the respective agencies on the issues and the consultations and other efforts made to resolve them (23 CFR 771.125(a)).

12. Wetland Impacts

When an alternative will impact wetlands the draft EIS should (1) identify the type, quality and function of wetlands involved, (2) describe the impacts to the wetlands, (3) evaluate alternatives which would avoid these wetlands, and (4) identify practicable measures to minimize harm to the wetlands. Wetlands should be identified by using the definition of 33 CFR 328.3(b) (issued on November 13, 1986) which requires the presence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology. Exhibits showing wetlands in the project impact area in relation to the alternatives, should be provided.

In evaluating the impact of the proposed project on wetlands, the following two items should be addressed: (1) the importance of the impacted wetland(s) and (2) the severity of this impact. Merely listing the number of acres taken by the various alternatives of a highway proposal does not provide sufficient information upon which to determine the degree of impact on the wetland ecosystem. The wetlands analysis should be sufficiently detailed to provide an understanding of these two elements.

In evaluating the importance of the wetlands, the analysis should consider such factors as: (1) the primary functions of the wetlands (e.g., flood control, wildlife habitat, ground water recharge, etc.), (2) the relative importance of these functions to the total wetland resource of the area, and (3) other factors such as uniqueness that may contribute to the wetlands importance.

In determining the wetland impact, the analysis should show the project's effects on the stability and quality of the wetland(s). This analysis should consider the short- and long-term effects on the wetlands and the importance of any loss such as: (1) flood control capacity, (2) shore line anchorage potential, (3) water pollution abatement capacity, and (4) fish and wildlife habitat value.

The methodology developed by FHWA and described in reports numbered FHWA-IP-82-23 and FHWA-IP-82-24, "A Method for Wetland Functional Assessment Volumes I and II," is recommended for use in conducting this analysis. Knowing the importance of the wetlands involved and the degree of the impact, the HA and FHWA will be in a better position to determine the mitigation efforts necessary to minimize harm to these wetlands. Mitigation measures which should be considered include preservation and improvement of existing wetlands and creation of new wetlands (consistent with 23 CFR 777).

If the preferred alternative is located in wetlands, to the fullest extent possible, the final EIS needs to contain the finding required by Executive Order 11990 that there are no practicable alternatives to construction in wetlands. Where the finding is included, approval of the final EIS will document compliance with the Executive Order 11990 requirements (23 CFR 771.125(a)(1)). The finding should be included in a separate subsection entitled "Only Practicable Alternative Finding" and should be supported by the following information:

- (a) a reference to Executive Order 11990;
- (b) an explanation why there are no practicable alternatives to the proposed action;
- (c) an explanation why the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands; and
- (d) a concluding statement that: "Based upon the above considerations, it is determined that there is no practicable alternative to the proposed construction in wetlands and that the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use."

13. Water Body Modification and Wildlife Impacts

For each alternative under detailed study, the draft EIS should contain exhibits and discussions identifying the location and extent of water body modifications (e.g., impoundment, relocation, channel deepening, filling, etc.). The use of the stream or body of water for recreation, water supply, or other purposes should be identified. Impacts to fish and wildlife resulting from loss degradation, or modification of aquatic or terrestrial habitat should also be discussed. The results of coordination with appropriate Federal, State and local agencies should be documented in the draft EIS. For example, coordination with FWS under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958.

14. Floodplain Impacts

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) maps or, if NFIP maps are not available, information developed by the highway agency should be used to determine whether an alternative will encroach on the base (100-year) floodplain. The location hydraulic studies required by 23 CFR 650, Subpart A must include a discussion of the following items commensurate with the level of risk or environmental impact, for each alternative which encroaches on base floodplains or would support base floodplain development:

- (a) The flooding risks;
- (b) The impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values;
- (c) The support of probable incompatible floodplain development (i.e., any development that is not consistent with a community's floodplain development plan);
- (d) The measures to minimize floodplain impacts; and
- (e) The measures to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values.

The draft EIS should briefly summarize the results of the location hydraulic studies. The summary should identify the number of encroachments and any support of incompatible floodplain developments and their potential impacts. Where an encroachment or support of incompatible floodplain development results in substantial impacts, the draft EIS should provide more detailed information on the location, impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. In addition, if any alternative (1) results in a floodplain encroachment or supports incompatible floodplain development having significant impacts or (2) requires a commitment to a particular structure size or type, the draft EIS needs to include an evaluation and discussion of practicable alternatives to the structure or to the significant encroachment. The draft EIS should include exhibits which display the alternatives, the base floodplains and, where applicable, the regulatory floodways.

If the preferred alternative includes a floodplain encroachment having significant impacts, the final EIS must include a finding that it is the only practicable alternative as required by 23 CFR 650, Subpart A. The finding should refer to Executive Order 11988 and 23 CFR 650, Subpart A. It should be included in a separate subsection entitled "Only Practicable Alternative Finding" and must be supported by the following information.

- (a) The reasons why the proposed action must be located in the floodplain;
- (b) The alternatives considered and why they were not practicable; and
- (c) A statement indicating whether the action conforms to applicable State or local floodplain protection standards.

For each alternative encroaching on a designated or proposed regulatory floodway, the draft EIS should provide a preliminary indication of whether the encroachment would be consistent with or require a revision to the regulatory floodway. Engineering and environmental analyses should be undertaken, commensurate with level of encroachment, to permit the consistency evaluation and identify impacts. Coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and appropriate State and local government agencies should be undertaken for each floodway encroachment. If the preferred alternative encroaches on a regulatory floodway, the final EIS should discuss the consistency of the action with the regulatory floodway. If a floodway revision is necessary, the EIS should include evidence from FEMA and local or State agency indicating that such revision would be acceptable.

15. Wild and Scenic Rivers

If the proposed action could have foreseeable adverse effects on a river on the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System or a river under study for designation to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, the draft EIS should identify early coordination undertaken with the agency responsible for managing the listed or study river (i.e., National Park Service (NPS), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), or Forest Service (FS)). For each alternative under consideration, the EIS should identify the potential adverse effects on the natural, cultural, and recreational values of the listed or study river. Adverse effects include alteration of the free-flowing nature of the river, alteration of the setting or deterioration of water quality. If it is determined that any of the alternatives could foreclose options to designate a study river under the Act, or adversely affect those qualities of a listed river for which it was designated, to the fullest extent possible, the draft EIS needs to reflect consultation with the managing agency on avoiding or mitigating the impacts (23 CFR 771.123(c)). The final EIS should identify measures that will be included in the preferred alternative to avoid or mitigate such impacts.

Publicly owned waters of designated wild and scenic rivers are protected by Section 4(f). Additionally, public lands adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River may be subject to Section 4(f) protection. An examination of any adopted or proposed management plan for a listed river should be helpful in making the determination on applicability of Section 4(f). For each alternative that takes such land, coordination with the agency responsible for managing the river (either NPS, FWS, BLM, or FS) will provide information on the management plan, specific affected land uses and any necessary Section 4(f) coordination.

16. Coastal Barriers

The Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) establishes certain coastal areas to be protected by prohibiting the expenditure of Federal funds for new and expanded facilities within designated coastal barrier units. When a proposed project impacts a coastal barrier unit, the draft EIS should: include a map showing the relationship of each alternative to the unit(s); identify direct and indirect impacts to the unit(s); quantifying and describing the impacts as appropriate; discuss the results of early coordination with FWS, identifying any issues raised and how they were addressed, and; identify any alternative which (if selected) would require an exception under the Act. Any issues identified or exceptions required for the preferred alternative should be resolved prior to its selection. This resolution should be documented in the final EIS.

17. Coastal Zone Impacts

Where the proposed action is within, or is likely to affect land or water uses within the area covered by a State Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP) approved by the Department of Commerce, the draft EIS should briefly describe the portion of the affected CZMP plan, identify the potential impacts, and include evidence of coordination with the State Coastal Zone Management agency or appropriate local agency. The final EIS should include the State Coastal Zone Management agency's determination on consistency with the State CZMP plan. (In some States, an agency will make a consistency determination only after the final EIS is approved, but will provide a preliminary indication before the final EIS that the project is "not inconsistent" or

“appears to be consistent” with the plan.) (For direct Federal actions, the final EIS should include the lead agency’s consistency determination and agreement by the State CZM agency.) If the preferred alternative is inconsistent with the State’s approved CZMP, it can be Federally funded only if the Secretary of Commerce makes a finding that the proposed action is consistent with the purpose or objectives of the CZM Act or is necessary in the interest of national security. To the fullest extent possible, such a finding needs to be included in the final EIS. If the finding is denied, the action is not eligible for Federal funding unless modified in such a manner to remove the inconsistency finding. The final EIS should document such results.

18. Threatened or Endangered Species

The HA must obtain information from the FWS of the DOI and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) of the Department of Commerce to determine the presence or absence of listed and proposed threatened or endangered species and designated and proposed critical habitat in the proposed project area (50 CFR 402.12(c)). The information may be (1) a published geographical list of such species or critical habitat; (2) a project-specific notification of a list of such species or critical habitat; or (3) substantiated information from other credible sources. Where the information is obtained from a published geographical list the reasons why this would satisfy the coordination with DOI should be explained. If there are no species or critical habitat in the proposed project area, the Endangered Species Act requirements have been met. The results of this coordination should be included in the draft EIS.

When a proposed species or a proposed critical habitat may be present in the proposed project area, an evaluation or, if appropriate, a biological assessment is made on the potential impacts to identify whether any such species or critical habitat are likely to be adversely affected by the project. Informal consultation with FWS and/or NMFS should be undertaken during the evaluation. The draft EIS should include exhibits showing the location of the species or habitat, summarize the evaluation and potential impacts, identify proposed mitigation measures, and evidence coordination with FWS and/or NMFS. If the project is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any proposed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of proposed critical habitat, the HA in consultation with the FHWA must confer with FWS and/or NMFS to attempt to resolve potential conflicts by avoiding, minimizing, or reducing the project impacts (50 CFR 402.10(a)). If the preferred alternative is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any proposed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of proposed critical habitat, a conference with FWS and/or NMFS must be held to assist in identifying and resolving potential conflicts. To the fullest extent possible, the final EIS needs to summarize the results of the conference and identify reasonable and prudent alternatives to avoid the jeopardy to such proposed species or critical habitat. If no alternatives exist, the final EIS should explain the reasons why and identify any proposed mitigation measures to minimize adverse effects.

When a listed species or a designated critical habitat may be present in the proposed project area, a biological assessment must be prepared to identify any such species or habitat which are likely to be adversely affected by the proposed project (50 CFR 402.12). Informal consultation should be undertaken or, if desirable, a conference held with FWS and/or NMFS during

preparation of the biological assessment. The draft EIS should summarize the following data from the biological assessment:

- (a) The species distribution, habitat needs, and other biological requirements;
- (b) The affected areas of the proposed project;
- (c) Possible impacts to the species including opinions of recognized experts on the species at issue;
- (d) Measures to avoid or minimize adverse impacts; and
- (e) Results of consultation with FWS and/or NMFS.

In selecting an alternative, jeopardy to a listed species or the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat must be avoided (50 CFR 402.01(a)). If the biological assessment indicates that there are no listed species or critical habitat present that are likely to be adversely affected by the preferred alternative, the final EIS should evidence concurrence by the FWS and/or NMFS in such a determination and identify any proposed mitigation for the preferred alternative.

If the results of the biological assessment or consultation with FWS and/or NMFS show that the preferred alternative is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat, to the fullest extent possible, the final EIS needs to contain: (1) a summary of the biological assessment (see data above for draft EIS); (2) a summary of the steps taken, including alternatives or measures evaluated and conferences and consultations held, to resolve the project's conflicts with the listed species or critical habitat; (3) a copy of the biological opinion; (4) a request for an exemption from the Endangered Species Act; (5) the results of the exemption request; and (6) a statement that (if the exemption is denied) the action is not eligible for Federal funding.

19. Historic and Archeological Preservation

The draft EIS should contain a discussion demonstrating that historic and archeological resources have been identified and evaluated in accordance with the requirements of 36 CFR 800.4 for each alternative under consideration. The information and level of effort needed to identify and evaluate historic and archeological resources will vary from project to project as determined by the FHWA after considering existing information, the views of the SHPO and the Secretary of Interior's "Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation." The information for newly identified historic resources should be sufficient to determine their significance and eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. The information for archeological resources should be sufficient to identify whether each warrants preservation in place or whether it is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery and has minimal value for preservation in place. Where archeological resources are not a major factor in the selection of a preferred alternative, the determination of eligibility for the National Register of newly identified archaeological resources may be deferred until after circulation of the draft EIS.

The draft EIS discussion should briefly summarize the methodologies used in identifying historic and archeological resources. Because Section 4(f) of the DOT Act applies to the use of historic resources on or eligible for the National Register and to archeological resources on or eligible for the National Register and which warrant preservation in place, the draft EIS should describe the historical resources listed in or eligible for the National Register and identify any archeological resources that warrant preservation in place. The draft EIS should summarize the impacts of each alternative on and proposed mitigation measures for each resource. The document should evidence coordination with the SHPO on the significance of newly identified historic and archaeological resources, the eligibility of historic resources for the National Register and the effects of each alternative on both listed and eligible historic resources. Where the draft EIS discusses eligibility for the National Register of archeological resources, the coordination with the SHPO on eligibility and effect should address both historic and archeological resources.

The draft EIS can serve as a vehicle for affording the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment pursuant to Section 106 requirements if the document contains the necessary information required by 36 CFR 800.8. The draft EIS transmittal letter to the ACHP should specifically request its comments pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6.

To the fullest extent possible, the final EIS needs to demonstrate that all the requirements of 36 CFR 800 have been met. If the preferred alternative has no effect on historic or archeological resources on or eligible for the National Register, the final EIS should indicate coordination with and agreement by the SHPO. If the preferred alternative has an effect on a resource on or eligible for the National Register, the final EIS should contain (a) a determination of no adverse effect concurred in by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, (b) an executed memorandum of agreement (MOA), or (c) in the case of a rare situation where FHWA is unable to conclude the MOA, a copy of comments transmitted from the ACHP to the FHWA and the FHWA response to those comments.

The proposed use of land from an historic resource on or eligible for the National Register will normally require an evaluation and approval under Section 4(f) of the DOT Act. Section 4(f) also applies to all archaeological sites on or eligible for the National Register and which warrant preservation in place. (See Section IX for information on Section 4(f) evaluation.)

20. Hazardous Waste Sites

Hazardous waste sites are regulated by the Resource Conservation and Recovery ACT (RCRA) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). During early planning, the location of permitted and nonregulated hazardous waste sites should be identified. Early coordination with the appropriate Regional Office of the EPA and the appropriate State agency will aid in identifying known or potential hazardous waste sites. If known or potential waste sites are identified, the locations should be clearly marked on a map showing their relationship to the alternatives under consideration. If a known or potential hazardous waste site is affected by an alternative, information about the site, the potential involvement, impacts and public health concerns of the affected alternative(s) and the proposed mitigation measures to eliminate or minimize impacts or public health concerns should be discussed in the draft EIS.

If the preferred alternative impacts a known or potential hazardous waste site, the final EIS should address and resolve the issues raised by the public and governmental agencies.

21. Visual Impacts

The draft EIS should state whether the project alternatives have a potential for visual quality impacts. When this potential exists, the draft EIS should identify the impacts to the existing visual resource, the relationship of the impacts to potential viewers of and from the project, as well as measures to avoid, minimize, or reduce the adverse impacts. When there is potential for visual quality impacts, the draft EIS should explain the consideration given to design quality, art, and architecture in the project planning. These values may be particularly important for facilities located in visually sensitive urban or rural settings. When a proposed project will include features associated with design quality, art or architecture, the draft EIS should be circulated to officially designated State and local arts councils and, as appropriate, other organizations with an interest in design, art, and architecture. The final EIS should identify any proposed mitigation for the preferred alternative.

22. Energy

Except for large scale projects, a detailed energy analysis including computations of BTU requirements, etc., is not needed. For most projects, the draft EIS should discuss in general terms the construction and operational energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives under consideration. The discussion should be reasonable and supportable. It might recognize that the energy requirements of various construction alternatives are similar and are generally greater than the energy requirements of the no-build alternative. Additionally, the discussion could point out that the post-construction, operational energy requirements of the facility should be less with the build alternative as opposed to the no-build alternative. In such a situation, one might conclude that the savings in operational energy requirements would more than offset construction energy requirements and thus, in the long term, result in a net savings in energy usage.

For large-scale projects with potentially substantial energy impacts, the draft EIS should discuss the major direct and/or indirect energy impacts and conservation potential of each alternative. Direct energy impacts refer to the energy consumed by vehicles using the facility. Indirect impacts include construction energy and such items as the effects of any changes in automobile usage. The alternative's relationship and consistency with a State and/or regional energy plan, if one exists, should also be indicated.

The final EIS should identify any energy conservation measures that will be implemented as apart of the preferred alternative. Measures to conserve energy include the use of high-occupancy vehicle incentives and measures to improve traffic flow.

23. Construction Impacts

The draft EIS should discuss the potential adverse impacts (particularly air, noise, water, traffic congestion, detours, safety, visual, etc.) associated with construction of each alternative and

identify appropriate mitigation measures. Also, where the impacts of obtaining borrow or disposal of waste material are important issues, they should be discussed in the draft EIS along with any proposed measure to minimize these impacts. The final EIS should identify any proposed mitigation for the preferred alternative.

24. The Relationship Between Local Short-term Uses of Man's Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-term Productivity

The EIS should discuss in general terms the proposed action's relationship of local short-term impacts and use of resources and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity. This general discussion might recognize that the build alternatives would have similar impacts. The discussion should point out that transportation improvements are based on State and/or local comprehensive planning which consider(s) the need for present and future traffic requirements within the context of present and future land use development. In such a situation, one might then conclude that the local short-term impacts and use of resources by the proposed action is consistent with the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity for the local area, State, etc.

25. Any Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Which Would be Involved in the Proposed Action

The EIS should discuss in general terms the proposed action's irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources. This general discussion might recognize that the build alternatives would require a similar commitment of natural, physical, human, and fiscal resources. An example of such discussion would be as follows:

"Implementation of the proposed action involves a commitment of a range of natural, physical, human, and fiscal resources. Land used in the construction of the proposed facility is considered an irreversible commitment during the time period that the land is used for a highway facility. However, if a greater need arises for use of the land or if the highway facility is no longer needed, the land can be converted to another use. At present, there is no reason to believe such a conversion will ever be necessary or desirable.

Considerable amounts of fossil fuels, labor, and highway construction materials such as cement, aggregate, and bituminous material are expended. Additionally, large amounts of labor and natural resources are used in the fabrication and preparation of construction materials. These materials are generally not retrievable. However, they are not in short supply and their use will not have an adverse effect upon continued availability of these resources. Any construction will also require a substantial one-time expenditure of both State and Federal funds which are not retrievable.

The commitment of these resources is based on the concept that residents in the immediate area, State, and region will benefit by the improved quality of the transportation system. These benefits will consist of improved accessibility and safety, savings in time, and greater availability of quality services which are anticipated to outweigh the commitment of these resources."

H. List of Preparers

This section should include lists of:

- (1) State (and local agency) personnel, including consultants, who were primarily responsible for preparing the EIS or performing environmental studies, and a brief summary of their qualifications, including educational background and experience.
- (2) The FHWA personnel primarily responsible for preparation or review of the EIS and their qualifications.
- (3) The areas of EIS responsibility for each preparer.

I. List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons to Whom Copies of the Statement are Sent

Draft EIS: List all entities from which comments are being requested (40 CFR 1502.10). Final EIS: Identify those entities that submitted comments on the draft EIS and those receiving a copy of the final EIS (23 CFR 771.125(a) and (g)).

J. Comments and Coordination

1. The draft EIS should contain copies of pertinent correspondence with each cooperating agency, other agencies and the public and summarize: 1) the early coordination process, including scoping; 2) the meetings with community groups (including minority and non-minority interests) and individuals; and 3) the key issues and pertinent information received from the public and government agencies through these efforts.
2. The final EIS should include a copy of substantive comments from the U.S. Secretary of Transportation (OST), each cooperating agency, and other commentors on the draft EIS. Where the response is exceptionally voluminous the comments may be summarized. An appropriate response should be provided to each substantive comment. When the EIS text is revised as a result of the comments received, a copy of the comments should contain marginal references indicating where revisions were made, or the response to the comments should contain such references. The response should adequately address the issue or concern raised by the commentor or, where substantive comments do not warrant further response, explain why they do not, and provide sufficient information to support that position.

The FHWA and the HA are not commentors within the meaning of NEPA and their comments on the draft EIS should not be included in the final EIS. However, the document should include adequate information for FHWA and the HA to ascertain the disposition of the comment(s).

3. The final EIS should (1) summarize the substantive comments on social, economic, environmental and engineering issues made at the public hearing, if one is held, or the

public involvement activities or which were otherwise considered and (2) discuss the consideration given to any substantive issue raised and provide sufficient information to support that position.

4. The final EIS should document compliance with requirements of all applicable environmental laws, Executive Orders, and other related requirements, such as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. To the extent possible, all environmental issues should be resolved prior to the submission of the final EIS. When disagreement on project issues exists with another agency, coordination with the agency should be undertaken to resolve the issues. Where the issues cannot be resolved, the final EIS should identify any remaining unresolved issues, the steps taken to resolve the issues, and the positions of the respective parties. Where issues are resolved through this effort, the final EIS should demonstrate resolution of the concerns.

K. Index

The Index should include important subjects and areas of major impacts so that a reviewer need not read the entire EIS to obtain information on a specific subject or impact.

L. Appendices

The EIS should briefly explain or summarize methodologies and results of technical analysis and research. Lengthy technical discussions should be contained in a technical report. Material prepared as appendices to the EIS should:

- (1) consist of material prepared specifically for the EIS;
- (2) consist of material which substantiates an analysis fundamental to the EIS;
- (3) be analytic and relevant to the decision to be made; and
- (4) be circulated with the EIS within FHWA, to EPA (Region), and to cooperating agencies and be readily available on request by other parties. Other reports and studies referred to in the EIS should be readily available for review or for copying at a convenient location.

VI. OPTIONS FOR PREPARING FINAL EISs

The CEQ regulations place heavy emphasis on reducing paperwork, avoiding unnecessary work, and producing documents which are useful to decision makers and to the public. With these objectives in mind, three different approaches to preparing final EISs are presented below. The first two approaches can be employed on any project. The third approach is restricted to the conditions specified by CEQ (40 CFR 1503.4(c)).

A. Traditional Approach

Under this approach, the final EIS incorporates the draft EIS (essentially in its entirety) with changes made as appropriate throughout the document to reflect the selection of an alternative, modifications to the project, updated information on the affected environment, changes in the assessment of impacts, the selection of mitigation measures, wetland and floodplain findings, the results of coordination, comments received on the draft EIS and responses to these comments, etc. Since so much information is carried over from the draft to the final, important changes are sometimes difficult for the reader to identify. Nevertheless, this is the approach most familiar to participants in the NEPA process.

B. Condensed Final EIS

This approach avoids repetition of material from the draft EIS by incorporating, by reference, the draft EIS. The final EIS is, thus, a much shorter document than under the traditional approach; however, it should afford the reader a complete overview of the project and its impacts on the human environment.

The crux of this approach is to briefly reference and summarize information from the draft EIS which has not changed and to focus the final EIS discussion on changes in the project, its setting, impacts, technical analysis, and mitigation that have occurred since the draft EIS was circulated. In addition, the condensed final EIS must identify the preferred alternative, explain the basis for its selection, describe coordination efforts, and include agency and public comments, responses to these comments, and any required findings or determinations (40 CFR 1502.14(e) and 23 CFR 771.125(a)).

The format of the final EIS should parallel the draft EIS. Each major section of the final EIS should briefly summarize the important information contained in the corresponding section of the draft, reference the section of the draft that provides more detailed information, and discuss any noteworthy changes that have occurred since the draft was circulated.

At the time that the final is circulated, an additional copy of the draft EIS need not be provided to those parties that received a copy of the draft EIS when it was circulated. Nevertheless, if, due to the passage of time or other reasons, it is likely that they will have disposed of their original copy of the draft EIS, then a copy of the draft EIS should be provided with the final. In any case, sufficient copies of the draft EIS should be on hand to satisfy requests for additional copies. Both the draft EIS and the condensed final EIS should be filed with EPA under a single final EIS cover sheet.

C. Abbreviated Version of Final EIS

The CEQ regulation (40 CFR 1503.4(c)) provides the opportunity to expedite the final EIS preparation where the only changes needed in the document are minor and consist of the factual corrections and/or an explanation of why the comments received on the draft EIS do not warrant further response. In using this approach, care should be exercised to assure that the draft EIS contains sufficient information to make the findings in (2) below and that the number of errata

sheets used to make required changes is small and that these errata sheets together with the draft EIS constitute a readable, understandable, full disclosure document. The final EIS should consist of the draft EIS and an attachment containing the following:

- (1) Errata sheets making any necessary corrections to the draft EIS;
- (2) A section identifying the preferred alternative and a discussion of the reasons it was selected. The following should also be included in this section where applicable:
 - (a) final Section 4(f) evaluations containing the information described in Section IX of these guidelines;
 - (b) wetland finding(s);
 - (c) floodplain finding(s);
 - (d) a list of commitments for mitigation measures for the preferred alternative; and
- (3) Copies (or summaries) of comments received from circulation of the draft EIS and public hearing and responses thereto.

Only the attachment need be provided to parties who received a copy of the draft EIS, unless it is likely that they will have disposed of their original copy, in which case both the draft EIS and the attachment should be provided (40 CFR 1503.4(c)). Both the draft EIS and the attachment must be filed with EPA under a single final EIS cover sheet (40 CFR 1503.4(c)).

VII. DISTRIBUTION OF EISs AND SECTION 4(f) EVALUATIONS

A. Environmental Impact Statement

1. After clearance by FHWA, copies of all draft EISs must be made available to the public and circulated for comments by the HA to: all public officials, private interest groups, and members of the public known to have an interest in the proposed action or the draft EIS; all Federal, State, and local government agencies expected to have jurisdiction, responsibility, interest, or expertise in the proposed action; and States and Federal land management entities which may be affected by the proposed action or any of the alternatives (40 CFR 1502.19 and 1503.1). Distribution must be made no later than the time the document is filed with EPA for Federal Register publication and must allow for a minimum 45-day review period (40 CFR 1506.9 and 1506.10). Internal FHWA distribution of draft and final EISs is subject to change and is noted in memorandums to the Regional Administrators as requirements change.
2. Copies of all approved final EISs must be distributed to all Federal, State, and local agencies and private organizations, and members of the public who provided substantive

comments on the draft EIS or who requested a copy (40 CFR 1502.19). Distribution must be made no later than the time the document is filed with EPA for Federal Register publication and must allow for a minimum 30-day review period before the Record of Decision is approved (40 CFR 1506.9 and 1506.10). Two copies of all approved EISs should be forwarded to the FHWA Washington Headquarters (HEV-11) for recordkeeping purposes.

3. Copies of all EISs should normally be distributed to EPA and DOI as follows, unless the agency has indicated to the FHWA offices the need for a different number of copies:

- (a) The EPA Headquarters: five copies of the draft EIS and five copies of the final EIS (This is the "filing requirement" in Section 1506.9 of the CEQ regulation.) To the following address: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Federal Activities (A-104), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460.
- (b) The appropriate EPA Regional Office responsible for EPA's review pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Air Act: five copies of the draft EIS and five copies of the final EIS.
- (c) The DOI Headquarters to the following address:

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Environmental Project Review
Room 4239
18th and C Streets, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20240

- (i) All States in FHWA Regions 1, 3, 4, and 5, plus Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, Arkansas, Iowa, Louisiana, and Missouri; 12 copies of the draft EIS and 7 copies of the final EIS.
- (ii) Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas: 13 copies of the draft EIS and 8 copies of the final EIS.
- (iii) New Mexico and all States in FHWA Regions 8, 9, and 10, except Hawaii, North Dakota, and South Dakota: 14 copies of the draft EIS and 9 copies of the final EIS.

Note: DOI Headquarters will make distribution within its Department. While not required, advance distribution to DOI field offices may be helpful to expedite their review.

B. Section 4(f) Evaluation

If the Section 4(f) evaluation is included in a draft EIS, the DOI Headquarters does not need additional copies of the draft or final EIS/Section 4(f) evaluation. If the Section 4(f) evaluation is

processed separately or as part of an EA, the DOI should receive seven copies of the draft Section 4(f) evaluation for coordination and seven copies of the final Section 4(f) evaluation for information. In addition to coordination with DOI, draft Section 4(f) evaluations must be coordinated with the officials having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) where these agencies have an interest in or jurisdiction over the affected Section 4(f) resource (23 CFR 771.135(i)). The point of coordination for HUD is the appropriate Regional Office and for USDA, the Forest Supervisor of the affected National Forest. One copy should be provided to the officials with jurisdiction and two copies should be submitted to HUD and USDA when coordination is required.

VIII. RECORD OF DECISION — FORMAT AND CONTENT

The Record of Decision (ROD) will explain the reasons for the project decision, summarize any mitigation measures that will be incorporated in the project and document any required Section 4(f) approval. While cross-referencing and incorporation by reference of the final EIS (or final EIS supplement) and other documents are appropriate, the ROD must explain the basis for the project decision as completely as possible, based on the information contained in the EIS (40 CFR 1502.2). A draft ROD should be prepared by the HA and submitted to the Division Office with the final EIS. The following key items need to be addressed in the ROD:

A. Decision.

Identify the selected alternative. Reference to the final EIS (or final EIS supplement) may be used to reduce detail and repetition.

B. Alternatives Considered.

This information can be most clearly organized by briefly describing each alternative and explaining the balancing of values which formed the basis for the decision. This discussion must identify the environmentally preferred alternative(s) (i.e., the alternative(s) that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment) (40 CFR 1505.2(b)). Where the selected alternative is other than the environmentally preferable alternative, the ROD should clearly state the reasons for not selecting the environmentally preferred alternative. If lands protected by Section 4(f) were a factor in the selection of the preferred alternative, the ROD should explain how the Section 4(f) lands influenced the selection.

The values (social, economic, environmental, cost-effectiveness, safety, traffic, service, community planning, etc.) which were important factors in the decision-making process should be clearly identified along with the reasons some values were considered more important than others. The Federal-aid highway program mandate to provide safe and efficient transportation in the context of all other Federal requirements and the beneficial impacts of the proposed transportation improvements should be included in this balancing. While any decision represents a balancing of the values, the ROD should reflect the manner in which these values were considered in arriving at the decision.

C. Section 4(f).

Summarize the basis for any Section 4(f) approval when applicable (23 CFR 771.127(a)). The discussion should include the key information supporting such approval. Where appropriate, this information may be included in the alternatives discussion above and referenced in this paragraph to reduce repetition.

D. Measures to Minimize Harm.

Describe the specific measures adopted to minimize environmental harm and identify those standard measures (e.g., erosion control, appropriate for the proposed action). State whether all practicable measures to minimize environmental harm have been incorporated into the decision and, if not, why they were not (40 CFR 1505.2(c)).

E. Monitoring or Enforcement Program.

Describe any monitoring or enforcement program which has been adopted for specific mitigation measures, as outlined in the final EIS.

F. Comments on Final EIS.

All substantive comments received on the final EIS should be identified and given appropriate responses. Other comments should be summarized and responses provided where appropriate.

For recordkeeping purposes, a copy of the signed ROD should be provided to the Washington Headquarters (HEV-11). For a ROD approved by the Division Office, copies should be sent to both the Washington Headquarters and the Regional Office.

IX. SECTION 4(f) EVALUATIONS — FORMAT AND CONTENT

A Section 4(f) evaluation must be prepared for each location within a proposed project before the use of Section 4(f) land is approved (23 CFR 771.135(a)). For projects processed with an EIS or an EA/FONSI, the individual Section 4(f) evaluation should be included as a separate section of the document, and for projects processed as categorical exclusions, as a separate Section 4(f) evaluation document. Pertinent information from various sections of the EIS or EA/FONSI may be summarized in the Section 4(f) evaluation to reduce repetition. Where an issue on constructive use Section 4(f) arises and FHWA decides that Section 4(f) does not apply, the environmental document should contain sufficient analysis and information to demonstrate that the resource(s) is not substantially impaired.

The use of Section 4(f) land may involve concurrent requirements of other Federal agencies. Examples include consistency determinations for the use of public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, compatibility determinations for the use of land in the National Wildlife Refuge System and the National Park System, determinations of direct and adverse effects for Wild and Scenic Rivers, and approval of land conversions under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The mitigation plan developed for the project should include

measures which would satisfy the various requirements. For example, Section 6(f) directs the Department of the Interior (National Park Service) to assure that replacement lands of equal value, location and usefulness are provided as conditions to approval of land conversions. Therefore, where a Section 6(f) land conversion is proposed for a highway project, replacement land will be necessary. Regardless of the mitigation proposed, the draft and final Section 4(f) evaluations should discuss the results of coordination with the public official having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) land and document the National Park Service's position on the Section 6(f) land transfer, respectively.

A. Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation

The following format and content are suggested. The listed information should be included in the Section 4(f) evaluation, as applicable.

1. Proposed Action.

Where a separate Section 4(f) evaluation is prepared, describe the proposed project and explain the purpose and need for the project.

2. Section 4(f) Property.

Describe each Section 4(f) resource which would be used by any alternative under consideration. The following information should be provided:

- (a) A detailed map or drawing of sufficient scale to identify the relationship of the alternatives to the Section 4(f) property.
- (b) Size (acres or square feet) and location (maps or other exhibits such as photographs, sketches, etc.) of the affected Section 4(f) property.
- (c) Ownership (city, county, State, etc.) and type of Section 4(f) property (park, recreation, historic, etc.).
- (d) Function of or available activities on the property (ball playing, swimming, golfing, etc.).
- (e) Description and location of all existing and planned facilities (ball diamonds, tennis courts, etc.).
- (f) Access (pedestrian, vehicular) and usage (approximate number of users/visitors, etc.).
- (g) Relationship to other similarly used lands in the vicinity.
- (h) Applicable clauses affecting the ownership, such as lease, easement, covenants, restrictions, or conditions, including forfeiture.

- (i) Unusual characteristics of the Section 4(f) property (flooding problems, terrain conditions, or other features) that either reduce or enhance the value of all or part of the property.

3. Impacts on the Section 4(f) Property(EIS).

Discuss the impacts on the Section 4(f) property for each alternative (e.g., amount of land to be used, facilities and functions affected, noise, air pollution, visual, etc.). Where an alternative (or alternatives) uses land from more than one Section 4(f) property, a summary table would be useful in comparing the various impacts of the alternative(s). Impacts (such as facilities and functions affected, noise, etc.) Which can be quantified should be quantified. Other impacts (such as visual intrusion) which cannot be quantified should be described.

4. Avoidance Alternatives.

Identify and evaluate location and design alternatives which would avoid the Section 4(f) property. Generally, this would include alternatives to either side of the property. Where an alternative would use land from more than one Section 4(f) property, the analysis needs to evaluate alternatives which avoid each and all properties (23 CFR 771.135(l)). The design alternatives should be in the immediate area of the property and consider minor alignment shifts, a reduced facility, retaining structures, etc. individually or in combination, as appropriate. Detailed discussions of alternatives in an EIS or EA need not be repeated in the Section 4(f) portion of the document, but should be referenced and summarized. However, when alternatives (avoiding Section 4(f) resources) have been eliminated from detailed study the discussion should also explain whether these alternatives are feasible and prudent and, if not, the reasons why.

5. Measures to Minimize Harm.

Discuss all possible measures which are available to minimize the impacts of the proposed action on the Section 4(f) property(ies). Detailed discussions of mitigation measures in the EIS or EA may be referenced and appropriately summarized, rather than repeated.

6. Coordination.

Discuss the results of preliminary coordination with the public official having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property and with regional (or local) offices of DOI and, as appropriate, the Regional Office of HUD and the Forest Supervisor of the affected National Forest. Generally, the coordination should include discussion of avoidance alternatives, impacts to the property, and measures to minimize harm. In addition, the coordination with the public official having jurisdiction should include, where necessary, a discussion of significance and primary use of the property.

Note: The conclusion that there are no feasible and prudent alternative is not normally addressed at the draft Section 4(f) evaluation stage. Such conclusion is made only after the draft Section 4(f) evaluation has been circulated and coordinated and any identified issues adequately evaluated.

B. Final Section 4(f) Evaluation

When the preferred alternative uses Section 4(f) land, the final Section 4(f) evaluation must contain (23 CFR 771.135(i) and (j)):

- (1) All the above information for a draft evaluation.
- (2) A discussion of the basis for concluding that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the Section 4(f) land. The supporting information must demonstrate that “there are unique problems or unusual factors involved in the use of alternatives that avoid these properties or that the cost, social, economic, and environmental impacts, or community disruption resulting from such alternatives reach extraordinary magnitudes” (23 CFR 771.135(a)(2)). This language should appear in the document together with the supporting information.
- (3) A discussion of the basis for concluding that the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) property. When there are no feasible and prudent alternatives which avoid the use of Section 4(f) land, the final Section 4(f) evaluation must demonstrate that the preferred alternative is a feasible and prudent alternative with the least harm on the Section 4(f) resources after considering mitigation to the Section 4(f) resources.
- (4) A summary of the appropriate formal coordination with the Headquarters Offices of DOI (and/or appropriate agency under that Department) and, as appropriate, the involved offices of USDA and HUD.
- (5) Copies of all formal coordination comments and a summary of other relevant Section 4(f) comments received and an analysis and response to any questions raised. Where new alternatives or modifications to existing alternatives are identified and will not be given further consideration, the basis for dismissing these alternatives should be provided and supported by factual information. Where Section 6(f) land is involved, the National Park Service’s position on the land transfer should be documented.
- (6) Concluding statement as follows: “Based upon the above considerations, there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the (identify Section 4(f) property) and the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the (Section 4(f) property) resulting from such use.”

X. OTHER AGENCY STATEMENTS

- A. The FHWA review of statements prepared by other agencies will consider the environmental impact of the proposal on areas within FHWA’s functional area of responsibility or special expertise (40 CFR 1503.2).

FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A
OCTOBER 30, 1987
ATTACHMENT

- B. Agencies requesting comments on highway impacts usually forward the draft EIS to the FHWA Washington Headquarters for comment. The FHWA Washington Headquarters will normally distribute these EISs to the appropriate Regional or Division Office (per Regional Office request) and will indicate where the comments should be sent. The Regional Office may elect to forward the draft statement to the Division Office for response.
- C. When a field office has received a draft EIS directly from another agency, it may comment directly to that agency if the proposal does not fall within the types indicated in item (d) of this section. If more than one DOT Administration is commenting at the Regional level, the comments should be coordinated by the DOT Regional Representative to the Secretary or designee. Copies of the FHWA comments should be distributed as follows:
 - (1) Requesting agency — original and one copy.
 - (2) P-14 — one copy.
 - (3) DOT Secretarial Representative--one copy.
 - (4) HEV-11 — one copy.
- D. The following types of actions contained in the draft EIS require FHWA Washington Headquarters review and such EISs should be forwarded to the Director, Office of Environmental Policy, along with Regional comments, for processing:
 - (1) actions with national implications, and
 - (2) legislation or regulations having national impacts or national program proposals.

XI. REEVALUATIONS

A. Draft EIS Reevaluation

If an acceptable final EIS is not received FHWA within 3 years from the date of the draft EIS circulation, then a written evaluation is required to determine whether there have been changes in the project or its surroundings or new information which would require a supplement to the draft EIS or a new draft EIS (23 CFR 771.129(a)). The written evaluation should be prepared by the HA in consultation with FHWA and should address all current environmental requirements. The entire project should be revisited to assess any changes that have occurred and their effect on the adequacy of the draft EIS.

There is no required format for the written evaluation. It should focus on the changes in the project, its surroundings and impacts and any new issues identified since the draft EIS. Field reviews, additional studies (as necessary) and coordination (as appropriate) with other agencies should be undertaken and the results included in the written evaluation. If, after reviewing the written evaluation, the FHWA concludes that a supplemental EIS or a new draft EIS is not required, the decision should be appropriately documented. Since the next major step in the project development process is preparation of a final EIS, the final EIS may document the

decision. A statement to this fact, the conclusions reached and supporting information should be briefly summarized in the Summary Section of the final EIS.

B. Final EIS Reevaluation

There are two types of reevaluation required for a final EIS: consultation and written evaluation (23 CFR 771.129(b) and (c)). For the first, consultation, the final EIS is reevaluated prior to proceeding with major project approval (e.g., right-of-way acquisition, final design, and plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E)) to determine whether the final EIS is still valid. The level of analysis and documentation, if any, should be agreed upon by the FHWA and HA. The analysis and documentation should focus on and be commensurate with the changes in the project and its surroundings, potential for controversy, and length of time since the last environmental action. For example, when the consultation occurs shortly after final EIS approval, an analysis usually should not be necessary. However, when it occurs nearly 3 years after final EIS approval, but before a written evaluation is required, the level of analysis should be similar to what normally would be undertaken for a written evaluation. Although written documentation is left to the discretion of the Division Administrator, it is suggested that each consultation be appropriately documented in order to have a record to show the requirements was met.

The second type of reevaluation is a written evaluation. It is required if the HA has not taken additional major steps to advance the project (i.e., has not received from FHWA authority to undertake final design, authority to acquire a significant portion of the right-of-way, or approval of the PS&E) within any 3-year time period after approval of the final EIS, the final supplemental EIS, or the last major FHWA approval action. The written evaluation should be prepared by the HA in consultation with FHWA and should address all current environmental requirements. The entire project should be revisited to assess any changes that have occurred and their effect on the adequacy of the final EIS.

There is no required format for the written evaluation. It should focus on the changes in the project, its surroundings and impacts and any new issues identified since the final EIS was approved. Field reviews, additional environmental studies (as necessary), and coordination with other agencies should be undertaken (as appropriate to address any new impacts or issues) and the results included in the written evaluation. The FHWA Division Office is the action office for the written evaluation. If it is determined that supplemental EIS is not needed, the project files should be document appropriately. In those rare cases where an EA is prepared to serve as the written evaluation, the files should clearly document whether new significant impacts were identified during the reevaluation process.

XII. SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS (EISs)

Whenever there are changes, new information, or further developments on a project which result in significant environmental impacts not identified in the most recently distributed version of the draft or final EIS, a supplemental EIS is necessary (40 CFR 1502.9(c)). If it is determined that the changes or new information do not result in new or different significant environmental impacts, the

FHWA Division Administrator should document the determination. (After final EIS approval, this documentation could take the form of notation to the files; for a draft EIS, this documentation could be a discussion in the final EIS.)

A. Format and Content of a Supplemental EIS

There is no required format for a supplemental EIS. The supplemental EIS should provide sufficient information to briefly describe the proposed action, the reason(s) why a supplement is being prepared, and the status of the previous draft or final EIS. The supplemental EIS needs to address only those changes or new information that are the basis for preparing the supplement and were not addressed in the previous EIS (23 CFR 771.130(a)). Reference to and summarizing the previous EIS is preferable to repeating unchanged, but still valid, portions of the original document. For example, some items such as affected environment, alternatives, or impacts which are unchanged may be briefly summarized and reference. New environmental requirements which became effective after the previous EIS was prepared need to be addressed in the supplemental EIS to the extent they apply to the portion of the project being evaluated and are relevant to the subject of the supplement (23 CFR 771.130(a)). Additionally, to provide an up-to-date status of compliance with NEPA, it is recommended that the supplement summarize the results of any reevaluations that have been performed for portions of or the entire proposed action. By this inclusion, the supplement will reflect an up-to-date consideration of the proposed action and its effects on the human environment. When a previous EIS is referenced, the supplemental EIS transmittal letter should indicate that copies of the original (draft or final) EIS are available and will be provided to all requesting parties.

B. Distribution of a Supplemental EIS

A supplemental EIS will be reviewed and distributed in the same manner as a draft and final EIS (23 CFR 771.130(d)). (See Section VII for additional information.)

XIII. Appendices

Two appendices are included as follows:

Appendix A: Environmental Laws, Authority and Related Statutes and Orders

Appendix B: Preparation and Processing of Notices of Intent.

**ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS,
AUTHORITY AND RELATED STATUTES AND ORDERS**

AUTHORITY:

42 United States Code (U.S.C.) 4321 et seq., National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

23 U.S.C. 138 and 49 U.S.C. 303, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966.

23 U.S.C. 109(h), (i), and (j) standards.

23 U.S.C. 128, Public Hearings.

23 U.S.C. 315, Rules, Regulations and Recommendations.

23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 771, Environmental Impact and Related Procedures.

40 CFR 1500 et seq., Council on Environmental Quality, Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act.

49 CFR 1.48(b), DOT Delegations of Authority to the Federal Highway Administration.

DOT Order 5610.1c, Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts, September 18, 1979, and subsequent revisions.

RELATED STATUTES AND ORDERS: The following is a list of major statutes and orders on the preparation of environmental documents.

7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq., Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981.

16 U.S.C. 461 et seq., Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act; and 23 U.S.C. 305.

16 U.S.C. 470f, Section 106, 110(d) and 110(f) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

16 U.S.C. 662, Section 2 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

16 U.S.C. 1452, 1456, Sections 303 and 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

16 U.S.C. 1271 et. seq., Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

16 U.S.C. 1536, Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq., Clean Water Act of 1977.

FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A
OCTOBER 30, 1987
ATTACHMENT - APPENDIX A

33 U.S.C. 1241 et seq., Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

42 U.S.C. 300(f) et seq., Safe Drinking Water Act.

42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq., Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970.

42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq., Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

42 U.S.C. 4901 et seq., Noise Control Act of 1972.

42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq., Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.

42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq., Clean Air Act.

42 U.S.C. 2000d-d4, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

43 U.S.C. Coastal Barriers Resources Act of 1982.

Executive Order 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality, as amended by Executive Order 11991, dated May 24, 1977.

Executive Order 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment, dated May 13, 1971, implemented by DOT Order 5650.1, dated November 20, 1972.

Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, dated May 24, 1977, implemented by DOT Order 5650.2, dated April 23, 1979.

Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, dated May 24, 1977, implemented by DOT Order 5660.1A, dated August 24, 1978.

Preparation and Processing of Notices of Intent

The CEQ regulations and Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 771, Environmental Impact and Related Procedures, require the Administration to publish a notice of intent in the Federal Register as soon as practicable after the decision is made to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and before the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). A notice of intent will also be published when a decision is made to supplement a final EIS, but will not be necessary when preparing a supplement to a draft EIS (23 CFR 771.130(d)). The responsibility for preparing notices of intent has been delegated to Regional Federal Highway Administrators and subsequently redelegated to Division Administrators. The notice should be sent directly to the Federal Register at the address provided in Attachment 1 and a copy provided to the Project Development Branch (HEV-11), Office of Environmental Policy, and the appropriate Region Office.

In cases where a notice of intent is published in the Federal Register and a decision is made not to prepare the draft EIS or, when the draft EIS has been prepared, a decision is made not to prepare a final EIS, a revised notice of intent should be published in the Federal Register advising of the decision and the reasons for not preparing the EIS. This applies to future and current actions being processed.

Notices of intent should be prepared and processed in strict conformance with the guidelines in Attachment 1 in order to ensure acceptance for publication by the Office of the Federal Register. A sample of each notice of intent for preparation of an EIS and a supplemental EIS is provided as Attachment 2.

The Project Development Branch (HEV-11) will serve as the Federal Register contact point for notice of intent. All inquiries should be directed to that office.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION AND PROCESSING OF NOTICES OF INTENT

FORMAT

1. Typed in black on white bond paper.
2. Paper size: 8-1/2" x 11".
3. Margins: Left at least 1-1/2", all others 1".
4. Spacing: All material double spaced (except title in heading).
5. Heading: Four items on first page at head of document (see Attachment 2):
 - Billing Code No. 4910-22 typed in brackets or parentheses
 - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (all upper case)
 - Federal Highway Administration
 - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT; COUNTY OR CITY, STATE (all upper case; single space)
6. Text: Five sections - AGENCY, ACTION, SUMMARY, FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT, AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION; each section title in upper case followed by colon (see Content (below) and Samples 1 and 2).
7. Closing:
 - Include the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title
 - Issued on:
(Indent 5 spaces and type or stamp in date when document is signed)
 - Signature line
(begin in middle of page; type name, title, and city under the signature; use name and title of the official actually signing the document (e.g., "John Doe, District Engineer," not "John Doe, for the Division Administrator"))
8. Document should be neat and in form suitable for public inspection. Two or more notices of intent can be included in a single document by making appropriate revisions to the heading and text of the document.

CONTENT

1. AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.
2. ACTION: Notice of Intent.
3. SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in
4. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: This section should state the name and address of a person or persons within the FHWA Division Office who can answer questions about the proposed action and the EIS as it is being developed. The listing of a telephone number is optional. State and/or local officials may also be listed, but always following the FHWA contact person.
5. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This section should contain:
 - a. a brief narrative description of the proposed action (e.g., location of the action, type of construction, length of the project, needs which will be fulfilled by the action);

For a supplement to a final EIS add: the original EIS number and approval date, and the reason(s) for preparing the supplement;
 - b. a brief description of possible alternatives to accomplish the goals of the proposed action (e.g., upgrade existing facility, do nothing (should always be listed), construction on new alignment, mass transit, multi-modal design); and
 - c. a brief description of the proposed scoping process for the particular action including whether, when, and where any scoping meeting will be held.

For a supplement to a final EIS: the scoping process is not required for a supplement; however, scoping should be discussed to the extent anticipated for the development of the supplement;

In drafting this section -
 - use plain English
 - avoid technical terms and jargon
 - always refer to the proposed action or proposed project (e.g., the proposed action would ...)
 - identify all abbreviations

FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A
OCTOBER 30, 1987
ATTACHMENT - APPENDIX B

- list FHWA first when other agencies (State or local) are listed as being involved in the preparation of the EIS

PROCESSING

1. Send three (3) duplicate originals each signed in ink by the issuing officer to:

Office of the Federal Register
National Archives and Records Administration
Washington, D.C. 20408
2. The duplicates must be identical in all respects. The Federal Register will accept electrostatic copies as long as they are readable and individually signed.
3. Three (3) additional copies are required if material is printed on both sides. If a single original and two certified copies are sent, the statement "CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY OF THE ORIGINAL" and the signature of a duly authorized certifying officer must appear on each certified copy.
4. A record should be kept of the date on which each notice is mailed to the Federal Register.
5. Send one (1) copy each to the Project Development Branch (HEV-11) and the Regional office.

S A M P L E 1

[4910-22]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT: WASHINGTON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Washington County, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James West, District Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 400 Market Street, State Capital, Washington 98507, Telephone: (206) 222-2222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Washington Department of Transportation and the Washington County Highway Department, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve U.S. Route 10 (U.S.10) in Washington County, Washington. The proposed improvement would involve the reconstruction of the existing U.S. 10 between the towns of Eastern and Western for a distance of about 20 miles.

Improvements to the corridor are considered necessary to provide for the existing and projected traffic demand. Also, included in this proposal is the replacement of the existing East End Bridge and a new interchange with Washington Highway 20 (W.H. 20) west of Eastern. Alternatives under consideration include (1) taking no action ; (2) using alternate travel modes; (3) widening the existing two-lane highway to four lanes; and (4) constructing a four-line, limited access highway on new location. Incorporated into and studied with the various build alternatives will be design variations of grade and alignment.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. A series of public meetings will be held in Eastern and Western between May and June 1985. In addition, a public hearing will be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meetings and hearing. The draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing. No formal scoping meeting is planned at this time.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments, and suggestions are invited from all interested parties.

FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A
OCTOBER 30, 1987
ATTACHMENT - APPENDIX B

Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: March 26, 1985.

John Doe
Division Administrator
Capital

S A M P L E 2

[4910-22]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT: WASHINGTON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that a supplement to a final environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Washington County, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James West, District Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 400 Market Street, State Capital, Washington 98507, Telephone: (206) 222-2222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Washington Department of Transportation and the Washington County Highway Department, will prepare a supplement to the final environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve U.S. Route 10 (U.S. 10) in Washington County, Washington. The original EIS for the improvements (FHWA-WA-EIS-85-06-F) was approved on December 21, 1985. The proposed improvements to U.S. 10 provide a divided four-lane, limited access highway on new location between the towns of Western and Eastern for a distance of about 20 miles. Improvements to the corridor are considered necessary to provide for existing and projected traffic demand.

The location and preliminary design of the western 15 miles portion of the proposed facility, from Western to U.S. 20, have been approved. However, substantial changes in the local street system and land use development in Eastern have reduced the suitability of the approved location east of U.S. 20. The portion of the proposed facility east of U.S. 20 is now to be restudied to determine if a new route location and connection to I-90 would be appropriate.

Alternatives under consideration include (1) taking no action and terminating the facility at U.S. 20; (2) constructing a four-lane, limited access highway on the approved location; (3) widening the existing two-lane U.S. 10 to four lanes with a connection to U.S. 20; and (4) constructing a four-lane, limited access highway on new location and connecting to I-90. Incorporated into and studied with the various build alternatives will be design variations of grade and alignment.

FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A
OCTOBER 30, 1987
ATTACHMENT - APPENDIX B

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. A public meeting will be held in Eastern in August 1987. In addition, a public hearing will be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meeting and hearing. The draft supplemental EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing. No formal scoping meeting will be held.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: April 23, 1987

John Doe
Division Administrator
Capital

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
722 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

March 16, 1981

**MEMORANDUM FOR FEDERAL NEPA LIAISONS, FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS
AND OTHER PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE NEPA PROCESS**

SUBJECT: Questions and Answers About the NEPA Regulations

During June and July of 1980, the Council on Environmental Quality, with the assistance and cooperation of EPA's EIS Coordinators from the ten EPA regions, held one-day meetings with federal, state and local officials in the ten EPA regional offices around the country. In addition, on July 10, 1980, CEQ conducted a similar meeting for the Washington, D.C. NEPA liaisons and persons involved in the NEPA process. At these meetings, CEQ discussed (a) the results of its 1980 review of Draft EIS's issued since the July 30, 1979 effective date of the NEPA regulations, (b) agency compliance with the Record of Decision requirements in Section 1505 of the NEPA regulations, and (c) CEQ's preliminary findings on how the scoping process is working. Participants at these meetings received copies of materials prepared by CEQ summarizing its oversight and findings.

These meetings also provided NEPA liaisons and other participants with an opportunity to ask questions about NEPA and the practical application of the NEPA regulations. A number of these questions were answered by CEQ representatives at the regional meetings. In response to the many requests from the agencies and other participants, CEQ has compiled forty of the most important or most frequently asked questions and their answers and reduced them to writing. The answers were prepared by the General Counsel of CEQ in consultation with the Office of Federal Activities of EPA. These answers, of course, do not impose any additional requirements beyond those of the NEPA regulations. This document does not represent new guidance under the NEPA regulations, but rather makes generally available to concerned agencies and private individuals the answers which CEQ has already given at the 1980 regional meetings. The answers also reflect the advice which the Council has given over the past two years to aid agency staff and consultants in their day-to-day application of NEPA and the regulations.

CEQ has also received numerous inquiries regarding the scoping process. CEQ hopes to issue written guidance on scoping later this year on the basis of its special study of scoping, which is nearing completion.

NICHOLAS C. YOST
General Counsel

INDEX

1. Range of Alternatives
2. Alternatives Outside the Capability of Applicant or Jurisdiction of Agency
3. No-Action Alternative
4. Agency's Preferred Alternative
5. Proposed Action v. Preferred Alternative
6. Environmentally Preferable Alternative
7. Difference Between Sections of EIS on Alternatives and Environmental Consequences
8. Early Application of NEPA
9. Applicant Who Needs Other Permits
10. Limitations on Actions During 30-Day Review Period for Final EIS
11. Limitations on Actions by an Applicant During EIS Process
12. Effective Date and Enforceability of the Regulations
13. Use of Scoping Before Notice of Intent to Prepare EIS
14. Rights and Responsibilities of Lead and Cooperating Agencies
15. Commenting Responsibilities of EPA
16. Third Party Contracts
17. Disclosure Statement to Avoid Conflict of Interest
18. Uncertainties About Indirect Effects of A Proposal
19. Mitigation Measures
20. Worst Case Analysis
21. Combining Environmental and Planning Documents
22. State and Federal Agencies as Joint Lead Agencies
23. Conflicts of Federal Proposal With Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls
24. Environmental Impact Statements on Policies, Plans, or Programs
25. Appendices and Incorporation by Reference
26. Index and Keyword Index In EISs
27. List of Preparers
28. Advance of Xerox Copies of EIS
29. Responses to Comments
30. Adoption of EISs
31. Application of Regulations to Independent Regulatory Agencies
32. Supplements To Old EISs
33. Referrals
34. Records of Decision
35. Time Required for the NEPA Process
36. Environmental Assessments (EA)
37. Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
38. Public Availability of EAs v. FONSI
39. Mitigation Measures Imposed in EAs and FONSI
40. Propriety of Issuing EA When Mitigation Reduces Impacts

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE NEPA REGULATIONS (1981)

- 1a. Q. *What is meant by "range of alternatives" as referred to in Section 1505.1(e)? **
- A. The phrase "range of alternatives" refers to the alternatives discussed in environmental documents. It includes all reasonable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated, as well as those other alternatives, which are eliminated from detailed study with a brief discussion of the reasons for eliminating them. Section 1502.14. A decisionmaker must not consider alternatives beyond the range of alternatives discussed in the relevant environmental documents. Moreover, a decisionmaker must, in fact, consider all the alternatives discussed in an EIS. Section 1505.1(e).
- 1b. Q. *How many alternatives have to be discussed when there is an infinite number of possible alternatives?*
- a. For some proposals there may exist a very large or even an infinite number of possible reasonable alternatives. For example, a proposal to designate wilderness areas within a National Forest could be said to involve an infinite number of alternatives from 0 to 100 percent of the forest. When there are potentially a very large number of alternatives, only a reasonable number of examples, covering the full spectrum of alternatives, must be analyzed and compared in the EIS. An appropriate series of alternatives might include dedicating 0, 10, 30, 50, 70, 90, or 100 percent of the Forest to wilderness. What constitutes a reasonable range of alternatives depends on the nature of the proposal and the facts in each case.
- 2a. Q. *If an EIS is prepared in connection with an application for a permit or other federal approval, must the EIS rigorously analyze and discuss alternatives that are outside the capability of the applicant or can it be limited to reasonable alternatives that can be carried out by the applicant?*
- A. Section 1502.14 requires the EIS to examine all reasonable alternatives to the proposal. In determining the scope of alternatives to be considered, the emphasis is on what is "reasonable" rather than on whether the proponent or applicant likes or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative. Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense, rather than simply desirable from the standpoint of the applicant.
- 2b. Q. *Must the EIS analyze alternatives outside the jurisdiction or capability of the agency or beyond what Congress has authorized?*
- A. An alternative that is outside the legal jurisdiction of the lead agency must still be analyzed in the EIS if it is reasonable. A potential conflict with local or federal law does not necessarily render an alternative unreasonable, although such conflicts must be considered. Section 1506.2(d). Alternatives that are outside the scope of what Congress has approved or funded must still be evaluated in the EIS if they are reasonable, because the EIS may serve as the basis for modifying the Congressional approval or funding in light of NEPA's goals and policies. Section 1500.1(a).

* References throughout the document are to the Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act. 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508.

3. Q. *What does the "no action" alternative include? If an agency is under a court order or legislative command to act, must the EIS address the "no action" alternative?*

A. Section 1502.14(d) requires the alternatives analysis in the EIS to "include the alternative of no action." There are two distinct interpretations of "no action" that must be considered, depending on the nature of the proposal being evaluated. The first situation might involve an action such as updating a land management plan where ongoing programs initiated under existing legislation and regulations will continue, even as new plans are developed. In these cases, "no action" is "no change" from current management direction or level of management intensity. To construct an alternative that is based on no management at all would be a useless academic exercise. Therefore, the "no action" alternative may be thought of in terms of continuing with the present course of action until that action is changed. Consequently, projected impacts of alternative management schemes would be compared in the EIS to those impacts projected for the existing plan. In this case, alternatives would include management plans of both greater and lesser intensity, especially greater and lesser levels of resource development.

The second interpretation of "no action" is illustrated in instances involving federal decisions on proposals for projects. "No action" in such cases would mean the proposed activity would not take place, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action would be compared with the effects of permitting the proposed activity or an alternative activity to go forward.

Where a choice of "no action" by the agency would result in predictable actions by others, this consequence of the "no action" alternative should be included in the analysis. For example, if denial of permission to build a railroad to a facility would lead to construction of a road and increased truck traffic, the EIS should analyze this consequence of the "no action" alternative.

In light of the above, it is difficult to think of a situation where it would not be appropriate to address a "no action" alternative. Accordingly, the regulations require the analysis of the no action alternative even if the agency is under a court order or legislative command to act. This analysis provides a benchmark, enabling decisionmakers to compare the magnitude of environmental effects of the action alternatives. It is also an example of a reasonable alternative outside the jurisdiction of the agency which must be analyzed. Section 1502.14(c). See Question 2 above. Inclusion of such an analysis in the EIS is necessary to inform the Congress, the public, and the President as intended by NEPA. Section 1500.1(a).

4a. Q. *What is the "agency's preferred alternative"?*

A. The "agency's preferred alternative" is the alternative which the agency believes would fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical and other factors. The concept of the "agency's preferred alternative" is different from the "environmentally preferable alternative," although in some cases one alternative may be both. See Question 6 below. It is identified so that agencies and the public can understand the lead agency's orientation.

4b. Q. *Does the "preferred alternative" have to be identified in the Draft EIS and the Final EIS or just in the Final EIS?*

A. Section 1502.14(e) requires the section of the EIS on alternatives to "identify the agency's preferred alternative if one or more exists, in the draft statement, and identify such alternative in the final statement ...". This means that if the agency has a preferred alternative at the Draft EIS stage, that alternative must be labeled or identified as such in the Draft EIS. If the responsible federal official in fact has no preferred alternative at the Draft EIS stage, a preferred alternative need not be identified there. By the time the Final EIS is filed, Section 1502.14(e) presumes the existence of a preferred alternative and requires its identification in the Final EIS "unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference."

4c. Q. *Who recommends or determines the "preferred alternative"?*

A. The lead agency's official with line responsibility for preparing the EIS and assuring its adequacy is responsible for identifying the agency's preferred alternative(s). The NEPA regulations do not dictate which official in an agency shall be responsible for preparation of EIS's, but agencies can identify this official in their implementing procedures, pursuant to Section 1507.3.

Even though the agency's preferred alternative is identified by the EIS preparer in the EIS, the statement must be objectively prepared and not slanted to support the choice of the agency's preferred alternative over the other reasonable and feasible alternatives.

5a. Q. *Is the "proposed action" the same thing as the "preferred alternative"?*

A. The "proposed action" may be, but is not necessarily, the agency's "preferred alternative." The proposed action may be a proposal in its initial form before undergoing analysis in the EIS process. If the proposed action is internally generated, such as preparing a land management plan, the proposed action might end up as the agency's preferred alternative. On the other hand, the proposed action may be granting an application to a non-federal entity for a permit. The agency may or may not have a "preferred alternative" at the Draft EIS stage (see Question 4 above). In that case, the agency may decide at the Final EIS stage, on the basis of the Draft EIS and the public and agency comments, that an alternative other than the proposed action is the agency's "preferred alternative."

5b. Q. *Is the analysis of the "proposed action" in an EIS to be treated differently from the analysis of alternatives?*

A. The degree of analysis devoted to each alternative in the EIS is to be substantially similar to that devoted to the "proposed action." Section 1502.14 is titled "Alternatives including the proposed action" to reflect such comparable treatment. Section 1502.14(b) specifically requires "substantial treatment" in the EIS of each alternative including the proposed action. This regulation does not dictate an amount of information to be provided, but rather, prescribes a level of treatment, which may, in turn, require varying amounts of information, to enable a reviewer to evaluate and compare alternatives.

6a. Q. *What is the meaning of the term "environmentally preferable alternative" as used in the regulations with reference to Records of Decisions? How is the term "environment" used in the phrase?*

A. Section 1505.2(b) requires that, in cases where an EIS has been prepared, the Record of Decision (ROD) must identify all alternatives that were considered "... specifying the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable." The environmentally preferable alternative is the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA's Section 101. Ordinarily, this means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative which best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources.

The Council recognizes that the identification of the environmentally preferable alternative may involve difficult judgments, particularly when one environmental value must be balanced against another. The public and other agencies reviewing a Draft EIS can assist the lead agency to develop and determine environmentally preferable alternatives by providing their views in comments on the Draft EIS. Through the identification of the environmentally preferable alternative, the decisionmaker is clearly faced with a choice between that alternative and others, and must consider whether the decision accords with the Congressionally declared policies of the Act.

6b. Q. *Who recommends or determines what is environmentally preferable?*

A. The agency EIS staff is encouraged to make recommendations of the environmentally preferable alternative(s) during EIS preparation. In any event, the lead agency official responsible for the EIS is encouraged to identify the environmentally preferable alternative(s) in the EIS. In all cases, commentors from other agencies and the public are also encouraged to address this question. The agency must identify the environmentally preferable alternative in the ROD.

7. Q. *What is the difference between the sections in the EIS on "alternatives" and "environmental consequences"? How do you avoid duplicating the discussion of alternatives in preparing these two sections?*

A. The "alternatives" section is the heart of the EIS. This section rigorously explores and objectively evaluates all reasonable alternatives including the proposed action. Section 1502.14. It should include relevant comparisons on environmental and other grounds. The "environmental consequences" section of the EIS discusses the specific environmental impacts or effects of each of the alternatives including the proposed action. Section 1502.16. In order to avoid duplication between these two sections, most of the "alternatives" section should be devoted to describing and comparing the alternatives. Discussion of the environmental impacts of these alternatives should be limited to a concise descriptive summary of such impacts in a comparative form, including charts or tables, thus, sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options. Section 1502.14. The "environmental consequences" section should be devoted largely to a scientific analysis of the direct and indirect environmental effects of the proposed action and of each of the alternatives. It forms the analytic basis for the concise comparison in the "alternatives" section.

8. Q. *Section 1501.2(d) of the NEPA regulations requires agencies to provide for the early application of NEPA to cases where actions are planned by private applicants or non-federal entities and are, at some stage, subject to federal approval of permits, loans, loan guarantees, insurance or other actions. What must and can agencies do to apply NEPA early in these cases?*

A. Section 1501.2(d) requires federal agencies to take steps toward ensuring that private parties and state and local entities initiate environmental studies as soon as federal involvement in their proposals can be foreseen. This section is intended to ensure that environmental factors are considered at an early stage in the planning process and to avoid the situation where the applicant for a federal permit or approval has completed planning and eliminated all alternatives to the proposed action by the time the EIS process commences or before the EIS process has been completed.

Through early consultation, business applicants and approving agencies may gain better appreciation of each other's needs and foster a decisionmaking process which avoids later unexpected confrontations.

Federal agencies are required by Section 1507.3(b) to develop procedures to carry out Section 1501.2(d). The procedures should include an "outreach program," such as a means for prospective applicants to conduct pre-application consultations with the lead and cooperating agencies. Applicants need to find out, in advance of project planning, what environmental studies or other information will be required, and what mitigation requirements are likely, in connection with the later federal NEPA process. Agencies should designate staff to advise potential applicants of the agency's NEPA information requirements and should publicize their pre-application procedures and information requirements in newsletters or other media used by potential applicants.

Complementing Section 1501.2(d), Section 1506.5(a) requires agencies to assist applicants by outlining the types of information required in those cases where the agency requires the applicant to submit environmental data for possible use by the agency in preparing an EIS.

Section 1506.5(b) allows agencies to authorize preparation of environmental assessments by applicants. Thus, the procedures should also include a means for anticipating and utilizing applicants' environmental studies or "early corporate environmental assessments" to fulfill some of the federal agency's NEPA obligations. However, in such cases, the agency must still evaluate independently the environmental issues and take responsibility for the environmental assessment.

These provisions are intended to encourage and enable private and other non-federal entities to build environmental considerations into their own planning processes in a way that facilitates the application of NEPA and avoids delay.

9. Q. *To what extent must an agency inquire into whether an applicant for a federal permit, funding or other approval of a proposal will also need approval from another agency for the same proposal or some other related aspect of it?*

A. Agencies must integrate the NEPA process into other planning at the earliest possible time to ensure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values, to avoid delays later in the process, and to head off potential conflicts. Specifically, the agency must "provide for cases

where actions are planned by . . . applicants," so that designated staff are available to advise potential applicants of studies or other information that will foreseeably be required for the later federal action; the agency shall consult with the applicant if the agency foresees its own involvement in the proposal; and it shall ensure that the NEPA process commences at the earliest possible time. Section 1501.2(d). (See Question 8).

The regulations emphasize agency cooperation early in the NEPA process. Section 1501.6. Section 1501.7 on "scoping" also provides that all affected Federal agencies are to be invited to participate in scoping the environmental issues and to identify the various environmental review and consultation requirements that may apply to the proposed action. Further, Section 1502.25(b) requires that the draft EIS list all the federal permits, licenses and other entitlements that are needed to implement the proposal.

These provisions create an affirmative obligation on federal agencies to inquire early, and to the maximum degree possible, to ascertain whether an applicant is or will be seeking other federal assistance or approval, or whether the applicant is waiting until a proposal has been substantially developed before requesting federal aid or approval.

Thus, a federal agency receiving a request for approval of assistance should determine whether the applicant has filed separate requests for federal approval or assistance with other federal agencies. Other federal agencies that are likely to become involved should be then contacted, and the NEPA process coordinated, to ensure an early and comprehensive analysis of the direct and indirect effects of the proposal and any related actions. The agency should inform the applicant that action on its application may be delayed unless it submits all other federal applications (where feasible to do so), so that all the relevant agencies can work together on the scoping process and preparation of the EIS.

10a. Q. *What actions by agencies and/or applicants are allowed during EIS preparation and during the 30-day review period after publication of a final EIS?*

A. No federal decision on the proposed action shall be made or recorded until at least 30 days after the publication by EPA of notice that the particular EIS has been filed with EPA. Sections 1505.2 and 1506.10. Section 1505.2 requires this decision to be stated in a public Record of Decision.

Until the agency issues its Record of Decision, no action by an agency or an applicant concerning the proposal shall be taken which would have an adverse environmental impact or limit the choice of reasonable alternatives. Section 1506.1(a). But this does not preclude preliminary planning or design work which is needed to support an application for permits or assistance. 1506.1(d).

When the impact statement in question is a program EIS, no major action concerning the program may be taken which may significantly affect the quality of the human environment, unless the particular action is justified independently of the program, is accompanied by its own adequate environmental impact statement and will not prejudice the ultimate decision on the program. Section 1506.1(c).

10.b. Q. *Do these limitations on action (described in Question 10a) apply to state or local agencies that have statutory delegated responsibility for preparation of environmental documents required by NEPA, for example, under the HUD Block Grant program?*

- A. Yes, these limitations do apply, without any variation from their application to federal agencies.
11. Q. *What actions must a lead agency take during the NEPA process when it becomes aware that a non-federal applicant is about to take an action within the agency's jurisdiction that would either have an adverse environmental impact or limit the choice of reasonable alternatives (e.g., prematurely commit money or other resources towards the completion of the proposal)?*
- A. The federal agency must notify the applicant that the agency will take strong affirmative steps to ensure that the objectives and procedures of NEPA are fulfilled. Section 1506.1(b). These steps could include seeking injunctive measures under NEPA, or the use of sanctions available under either the agency's statutory mission. For example, the agency might advise an applicant that, if it takes such action, the agency will not process its application.
- 12a. Q. *What actions are subject to the Council's new regulations, and what actions are grandfathered under the old guidelines?*
- A. The effective date of the Council's regulations was July 30, 1979 (except for certain HUD programs under the Housing and Community Development Act, 42 U.S.C. 5304(h), and certain state highway programs that qualify under Section 102(2)(D) of NEPA for which the regulations became effective on November 30, 1979). All the provisions of the regulations are binding as of that date, including those covering decisionmaking, public participation, referrals, limitations on actions, EIS supplements, etc. For example, a Record of Decision would be prepared even for decisions where the draft EIS was filed before July 30, 1979.
- But in determining whether or not the new regulations apply to the preparation of a particular environmental document, the relevant factor is the date of filing of the draft of that document. Thus, the new regulations do not require the redrafting of an EIS or supplement if the draft EIS or supplement was filed before July 30, 1979. However, a supplement prepared after the effective date of the regulations for an EIS issued in final before the effective date of the regulations would be controlled by the regulations.
- Even though agencies are not required to apply the regulations to an EIS or other document for which the draft was filed prior to July 30, 1979, the regulations encourage agencies to follow the regulations "to the fullest extent practicable"; i.e., if it is feasible to do so, in preparing the final document. Section 1506.12(a).
- 12b. Q. *Are projects authorized by Congress before the effective date of the Council's regulations grandfathered?*
- A. No. The date of Congressional authorization for a project is not determinative of whether the Council's regulations or former Guidelines apply to the particular proposal. No incomplete projects or proposals of any kind are grandfathered in whole or in part. Only certain environmental documents, for which the draft was issued before the effective date of the regulations, are grandfathered and subject to the Council's former Guidelines.

12c. Q. *Can a violation of the regulations give rise to a cause of action?*

A. While a trivial violation of the regulations would not give rise to an independent cause of action, such a cause of action would arise from a substantial violation of the regulations. Section 1500.3.

13. Q. *Can the scoping process be used in connection with preparation of an environmental assessment; i.e., before both the decision to proceed with an EIS and publication of a notice of intent?*

A. Yes. Scoping can be a useful tool for discovering alternatives to a proposal, or significant impacts that may have been overlooked. In cases where an environmental assessment is being prepared to help an agency decide whether to prepare an EIS, useful information might result from early participation by other agencies and the public in a scoping process.

The regulations state that the scoping process is to be preceded by a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS. But that is only the minimum requirement. Scoping may be initiated earlier, as long as there is appropriate public notice and enough information available on the proposal so that the public and relevant agencies can participate effectively.

However, scoping that is done before the assessment, and in aid of its preparation, cannot substitute for the normal scoping process after publication of the NOI, unless the earlier public notice stated clearly that this possibility was under consideration, and the NOI expressly provides that written comments on the scope of alternatives and impacts will still be considered.

14a. Q. *What are the respective rights and responsibilities of lead and cooperating agencies? What letters and memoranda must be prepared?*

A. After a lead agency has been designated (Section 1501.5), that agency has the responsibility to solicit cooperation from other federal agencies that have jurisdiction by law or special expertise on any environmental issue that should be addressed in the EIS being prepared. Where appropriate, the lead agency should seek the cooperation of state or local agencies of similar qualifications. When the proposal may affect an Indian reservation, the agency should consult with the Indian tribe. Section 1508.5. The request for cooperation should come at the earliest possible time in the NEPA process.

After discussions with the candidate cooperating agencies, the lead agency and the cooperating agencies are to determine by letter or by memorandum which agencies will undertake cooperating responsibilities. To the extent possible at this stage, responsibilities for specific issues should be assigned. The allocation of responsibilities will be completed during scoping. Section 1501.7(a)(4).

Cooperating agencies must assume responsibility for the development of information and the preparation of environmental analyses at the request of the lead agency. Section 1501.6(b)(3). Cooperating agencies are now required by Section 1501.6 to devote staff resources that were normally primarily used to critique or comment on the Draft EIS after its preparation, much earlier in the NEPA process — primarily at the scoping and Draft EIS preparation stages. If a cooperating agency determines that its resource limitations preclude

any involvement, or the degree of involvement (amount of work) requested by the lead agency, it must so inform the lead agency in writing and submit a copy of this correspondence to the Council. Section 1501.6(c).

In other words, the potential cooperating agency must decide early if it is able to devote any of its resources to a particular proposal. For this reason, the regulation states that an agency may reply to a request for cooperation that "other program commitments preclude any involvement or the degree of involvement requested in the action that is the subject of the environmental impact statement." (Emphasis added.) The regulation refers to the "action," rather than to the EIS, to clarify that the agency is taking itself out of all phases of the federal action, not just draft EIS preparation. This means that the agency has determined that it cannot be involved in the later stages of EIS review and comment, as well as decisionmaking on the proposed action. For this reason, cooperating agencies with jurisdiction by law (those which have permitting or other approval authority) cannot opt out entirely of the duty to cooperate on the EIS. See also Question 15, relating specifically to the responsibility of EPA.

14b. Q. *How are disputes resolved between lead and cooperating agencies concerning the scope and level of detail by analysis and the quality of data in impact statements?*

A. Such disputes are resolved by the agencies themselves. A lead agency, of course, has the ultimate responsibility for the content of an EIS. But it is supposed to use the environmental analysis and recommendations of cooperating agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise to the maximum extent possible, consistent with its own responsibilities as lead agency. Section 1501.6(a)(2).

If the lead agency leaves out a significant issue or ignores the advice and expertise of the cooperating agency, the EIS may be found later to be inadequate. Similarly, where cooperating agencies have their own decisions to make and they intend to adopt the environmental impact statement and base their decisions on it, one document should include all of the information necessary for the decisions by the cooperating agencies. Otherwise, they may be forced to duplicate the EIS process by issuing a new, more complete EIS or Supplemental EIS, even though the original EIS could have sufficed if it had been properly done at the outset. Thus, both lead and cooperating agencies have a stake in producing a document of good quality. Cooperating agencies also have a duty to participate fully in the scoping process to ensure that the appropriate range of issues is determined early in the EIS process.

Because the EIS is not the Record of Decision, but instead constitutes the information and analysis on which to base a decision, disagreements about conclusions to be drawn from the EIS need not inhibit agencies from issuing a joint document, or adopting another agency's EIS, if the analysis is adequate. Thus, if each agency has its own "preferred alternative," both can be identified in the EIS. Similarly, a cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law may determine in its own ROD that Alternative A is the environmentally preferable action, even though the lead agency has decided in its separate ROD that Alternative B is environmentally preferable.

14c. Q. *What are the specific responsibilities of federal and state cooperating agencies to review draft EIS's?*

- A. Cooperating agencies (i.e., agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise) and agencies that are authorized to develop or enforce environmental standards must comment on environmental impact statements within their jurisdiction, expertise or authority. Sections 1503.2, 1508.5. If a cooperating agency is satisfied that its views are adequately reflected in the environmental impact statement, it should simply comment accordingly. Conversely, if the cooperating agency determines that a draft EIS is incomplete, inadequate or inaccurate, or it has other comments, it should promptly make such comments, conforming to the requirements of specificity in Section 1503.3.
- 14d. Q. *How is the lead agency to treat the comments of another agency with jurisdiction by law or special expertise which has failed or refused to cooperate or participate in scoping or EIS preparation?*
- A. A lead agency has the responsibility to respond to all substantive comments raising significant issues regarding a draft EIS. Section 1503.4. However, cooperating agencies are generally under an obligation to raise issues or otherwise participate in the EIS process during scoping and EIS preparation if they reasonably can do so. In practical terms, if a cooperating agency fails to cooperate at the outset, such as during scoping, it will find that its comments at a later stage will not be as persuasive to the lead agency.
15. Q. *Are EPA's responsibilities to review and comment on the environmental effects of agency proposals under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act independent of its responsibility as a cooperating agency?*
- A. Yes. EPA has an obligation under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act to review and comment in writing on the environmental impact of any matter relating to the authority of the Administrator contained in proposed legislation, federal construction projects, other federal actions requiring EIS's, and new regulations. 42 U.S.C. Sec. 7609. This obligation is independent of its role as a cooperating agency under the NEPA regulations.
16. Q. *What is meant by the term "third party contracts" in connection with the preparation of an EIS? See Section 1506.5(c). When can "third party contracts" be used?*
- A. As used by EPA and other agencies, the term "third party contract" refers to the preparation of EIS's by contractors paid by the applicant. In the case of an EIS for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, the applicant, aware in the early planning stages of the proposed project of the need for an EIS, contracts directly with a consulting firm for its preparation. See 40 C.F.R. 6.604(g). The "third party" is EPA which, under Section 1506.5(c), must select the consulting firm, even though the applicant pays for the cost of preparing the EIS. The consulting firm is responsible to EPA for preparing an EIS that meets the requirements of the NEPA regulations and EPA's NEPA procedures. It is in the applicant's interest that the EIS comply with the law so that EPA can take prompt action on the NPDES permit application. The "third party contract" method under EPA's NEPA procedures is purely voluntary, though most applicants have found it helpful in expediting compliance with NEPA.

If a federal agency uses "third party contracting," the applicant may undertake the necessary paperwork for the solicitation of a field of candidates under the agency's direction, so long as the agency complies with Section 1506.5(c). Federal procurement requirements do not apply

to the agency because it incurs no obligations or costs under the contract, nor does the agency procure anything under the contract.

17a. Q. *If an EIS is prepared with the assistance of a consulting firm, the firm must execute a disclosure statement. What criteria must the firm follow in determining whether it has any "financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" which would cause a conflict of interest?*

A. Section 1506.5(c), which specifies that a consulting firm preparing an EIS must execute a disclosure statement, does not define "financial or other interest in the outcome of the project." The Council interprets this term broadly to cover any known benefits other than general enhancement of professional reputation. This includes any financial benefit such as a promise of future construction or design work on the project, as well as indirect benefits the consultant is aware of (e.g., if the project would aid proposals sponsored by the firm's other clients). For example, completion of a highway project may encourage construction of a shopping center or industrial park from which the consultant stands to benefit. If a consulting firm is aware that it has such an interest in the decision on the proposal, it should be disqualified from preparing the EIS to preserve the objectivity and integrity of the NEPA process.

When a consulting firm has been involved in developing initial data plans for the project, but does not have any financial or other interest in the outcome of the decision, it need not be disqualified from preparing the EIS. However, a disclosure statement in the draft EIS should clearly state the scope and extent of the firm's prior involvement to expose any potential conflicts of interest that may exist.

17b. Q. *If the firm in fact has no promise of future work or other interest in the outcome of the proposal, may the firm later bid in competition with others for future work on the project if the proposed action is approved?*

A. Yes.

18. Q. *How should uncertainties about indirect effects of a proposal be addressed, for example, in cases of disposal of federal lands, when the identity or plans of future landowners is unknown?*

A. The EIS must identify all the indirect effects that are known and make a good faith effort to explain the effects that are not known but are "reasonably foreseeable." Section 1508.8(b). In the example, if there is total uncertainty about the identity of future landowners or the nature of future land uses, then of course, the agency is not required to engage in speculation or contemplation about their future plans. But, in the ordinary course of business, people do make judgments based upon reasonably foreseeable occurrences. It will often be possible to consider the likely purchasers and the development trends in that area or similar areas in recent years; or the likelihood that the land will be used for an energy project, shopping center, subdivision, farm or factory. The agency has the responsibility to make an informed judgment, and to estimate future impacts on that basis, especially if trends are ascertainable or potential purchases have made themselves known. The agency cannot ignore these uncertain, but probable, effects of its decisions.

19a. Q. *What is the scope of mitigation measures that must be discussed?*

A. The mitigation measures discussed in an EIS must cover the range of impacts of the proposal. The measures must include such things as design alternatives that would decrease pollution emission, construction impacts, esthetic intrusion, as well as relocation assistance, possible land use controls that could be enacted, and other possible efforts. Mitigation measures must be considered even for impacts that by themselves would not be considered "significant." Once the proposal itself is considered as a whole to have significant effects, all of its specific effects on the environment (whether or not "significant") must be considered, and mitigation measures must be developed where it is feasible to do so. Sections 1502.14(f), 1502.16(h), 1508.14.

19b. Q. *How should an EIS treat the subject of available mitigation measures that are (1) outside the jurisdiction of the lead or cooperating agencies, or (2) unlikely to be adopted or enforced by the responsible agency?*

A. All relevant, reasonable mitigation measure that could improve the project are to be identified, even if they are outside the jurisdiction of the lead agency or the cooperating agencies and, thus, would not be committed as part of the ROD's of these agencies. Section 1502.16(h), 1505.2(c). This will serve to alert agencies or officials who can implement these extra measures and will encourage them to do so. Because the EIS is the most comprehensive environmental document, it is an ideal vehicle in which to lay out not only the full range of environmental impacts but also the full spectrum of appropriate mitigation.

However, to ensure that environmental effects of a proposed action are fairly assessed, the probability of the mitigation measures being implemented must also be discussed. Thus, the EIS and the Record of Decision should indicate the likelihood that such measures will be adopted or enforced by the responsible agencies. Sections 1502.16(h), 1505.2. If there is a history of non-enforcement or opposition to such measures, the EIS and Record of Decision should acknowledge such opposition or non-enforcement. If the necessary mitigation measures will not be ready for a long period of time, this fact, of course, should also be recognized.

20a. Q. *When must a worst case analysis be included in an EIS?*

A. If there are gaps in relevant information or scientific uncertainty pertaining to an agency's evaluation of significant adverse impacts on the human environment, an agency must make clear that such information is lacking or that the uncertainty exists. An agency must include a worst case analysis of the potential impacts of the proposal and an indication of the probability or improbability of their occurrence if (a) the information relevant to adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining the information are exorbitant, or (b) the information relevant to adverse impacts is important to the decision and the means to obtain it are not known.

NEPA requires that impact statements, at a minimum, contain information to alert the public and Congress to all known possible environmental consequences of agency action. Thus, one of the federal government's most important obligations is to present to the fullest extent possible, the spectrum of consequences that may result from agency decisions, and the details of their potential consequences for the human environment.

20b. Q. *What is the purpose of a worst case analysis? How is it formulated and what is the scope of the analysis?*

A. The purpose of the analysis is to carry out NEPA's mandate for full disclosure to the public of the potential consequences of agency decisions, and to cause agencies to consider those potential consequences when acting on the basis of scientific uncertainties or gaps in available information. The analysis is formulated on the basis of available information, using reasonable projections of the worst possible consequences of a proposed action.

For example, if there are scientific uncertainty and gaps in the available information concerning the numbers of juvenile fish that would be entrained in a cooling water facility, the responsible agency must disclose and consider the possibility of the loss of the commercial or sport fishery.

In addition to an analysis of a low probability/catastrophic impact event, the worst case analysis should also include a spectrum of events of higher probability but less drastic impact.

21. Q. *Where an EIS or an EA is combined with another project planning document (sometimes called "piggybacking"), to what degree may the EIS or EA refer to and rely upon information in the project document to satisfy NEPA's requirements?*

A. Section 1502.25 of the regulations requires that draft EIS's be prepared concurrently and integrated with environmental analyses and related surveys and studies required by other federal statutes. In addition, Section 1506.4 allows any environmental document prepared in compliance with NEPA to be combined with any other agency document to reduce duplication and paperwork.

However, these provisions were not intended to authorize the preparation of a short summary or outline EIS, attached to a detailed project report of land use plan containing the required environmental impact data. In such circumstances, the reader would have to refer constantly to the detailed report to understand the environmental impacts and alternatives which should have been found in the EIS itself.

The EIS must stand on its own as an analytical document which fully informs decisionmakers and the public of the environmental effects of the proposal and those of the reasonable alternatives. Section 1502.1. But, as long as the EIS is clearly identified and is self-supporting, it can be physically included in or attached to the project report or land-use plan, and may use attached report material as technical backup.

Forest Service environmental impact statements for forest management plans are handled in this manner. The EIS identifies the agency's preferred alternative, which is developed in detail as the proposed management plan. The detailed proposed plan accompanies the EIS through the review process, and the documents are appropriately cross-referenced. The proposed plan is useful for EIS readers as an example to show how one choice of management options translates into effects on natural resources. This procedure permits initiation of the 90-day public review of proposed forest plans, which is required by the National Forest Management Act.

All the alternatives are discussed in the EIS, which can be read as an independent document. The details of the management plan are not repeated in the EIS, and vice versa. This is a reasonable functional separation of the documents: The EIS contains information relevant to the choice among alternatives; the plan is a detailed description of proposed management activities suitable for use by the land managers. This procedure provides for concurrent compliance with the public review requirements of both NEPA and the National Forest Management Act.

Under some circumstances, a project report or management plan may be totally merged with the EIS, and the one document labeled as both "EIS" and "management plan" or "project report." This may be reasonable where the documents are short, or where the EIS format and the regulations for clear, analytical EIS's also satisfy the requirements for a project report.

22. Q. *May State and federal agencies serve as joint lead agencies? If so, how do they resolve law, policy and resource conflicts under NEPA and the relevant State Environmental Policy Act? How do they resolve differences in perspective where, for example, national and local needs may differ?*

A. Under Section 1501.5(b), federal, State or local agencies, as long as they include at least one federal agency, may act as joint lead agencies to prepare an EIS. Section 1506.2 also strongly urges State and local agencies and the relevant federal agencies to cooperate fully with each other. This should cover joint research and studies, planning activities, public hearings, environmental assessments, and the preparation of joint EIS's under NEPA and the relevant "little NEPA" State laws, so that one document will satisfy both laws.

The regulations also recognize that certain inconsistencies may exist between the proposed federal action and any approved State or local plan or law. The joint document should discuss the extent to which the federal agency would reconcile its proposed action with such plan or law. Section 1506.2(d). (See Question 23).

Because there may be differences in perspective as well as conflicts among federal, State and local goals for resource management, the Council has advised participating agencies to adopt a flexible, cooperative approach. The joint EIS should reflect all of their interests and missions, clearly identified as such. The final document would then indicate how State and local interests have been accommodated or would identify conflicts in goals (e.g., how a hydroelectric project, which might induce second home development, would require new land-use controls). The EIS must contain a complete discussion of scope and purpose of the proposal, alternatives, and impacts so that the discussion is adequate to meet the needs of local, State and federal decisionmakers.

23a. Q. *How should an agency handle potential conflicts between a proposal and the objectives of federal, State or local land-use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned? See Section 1502.16(c).*

A. The agency should first inquire of other agencies whether there are any potential conflicts. If there would be immediate conflicts, or if conflicts could arise in the future when the plans are finished (see Question 23b below), the EIS must acknowledge and describe the extent of those conflicts. If there are any possibilities of resolving the conflicts, these should be explained as well. The EIS should also evaluate the seriousness of the impact of the proposal on the land-use plans and policies and whether, or how much, the proposal will impair the

effectiveness of land use control mechanisms for the area. Comments from officials of the affected area should be solicited early and should be carefully acknowledged and answered in the EIS.

23b. Q. *What constitutes a "land use plan or policy" for purposes of this discussion?*

A. The term "land use plans," includes all types of formally adopted documents for land-use planning, zoning and related regulatory requirements. Local general plans are included, even though they are subject to future change. Proposed plans should also be addressed if they have been formally proposed by the appropriate government body in a written form and are being actively pursued by officials of the jurisdiction. Staged plans, which must go through phases of development such as the Water Resources Council's Level A, B, and C planning process, should also be included even though they are incomplete.

The term "policies" includes formally adopted statements of land use policy as embodied in laws or regulations. It also includes proposals for action such as the initiation of a planning process or a formally adopted policy statement of the local, regional or state executive branch, even if it has not yet been formally adopted by the local, regional or state legislative body.

23c. Q. *What options are available for the decisionmaker when conflicts with such plans or policies are identified?*

A. After identifying any potential land use conflicts, the decisionmaker must weigh the significance of the conflicts, among all the other environmental and non-environmental factors that must be considered in reaching a rational and balanced decision. Unless precluded by other law from causing or contributing to any inconsistency with the land use plans, policies or controls, the decisionmaker retains the authority to go forward with the proposal, despite the potential conflict. In the Record of Decision, the decisionmaker must explain what the decision was, how it was made, and what mitigation measures are being imposed to lessen adverse environmental impacts of the proposal, among the other requirements of Section 1505.2. This provision would require the decisionmaker to explain any decision to override land use plans, policies or controls for the area.

24a. Q. *When are EIS's required on policies, plans or programs?*

A. An EIS must be prepared if an agency proposed to implement a specific policy, to adopt a plan for a group of related actions, or to implement a specific statutory program or executive directive. Section 1508.18. In addition, the adoption of official policy in the form of rules, regulations and interpretations pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, treaties, conventions, or other formal documents establishing governmental or agency policy which will substantially alter agency programs could require an EIS. Section 1508.18. In all cases, the policy, plan, or program must have the potential for significantly affecting the quality of the human environment in order to require an EIS. It should be noted that a proposal "may exist in fact as well as by agency declaration that one exists." Section 1508.23.

24b. Q. *When is an area-wide or overview EIS appropriate?*

A. The preparation of an area-wide or overview EIS may be particularly useful when similar actions, viewed with other reasonably foreseeable or proposed agency actions, share common

timing or geography. For example, when a variety of energy projects may be located in a single watershed, or when a series of new energy technologies may be developed through federal funding, the overview or area-wide EIS would serve as a valuable and necessary analysis of the affected environment and the potential cumulative impacts of the reasonably foreseeable actions under that program or within that geographical area.

24c. Q. *What is the function of tiering in such cases?*

A. Tiering is a procedure which allows an agency to avoid duplication of paperwork through the incorporation by reference of the general discussions and relevant specific discussions from an environmental impact statement of broader scope into one of lesser scope or vice versa. In the example given in Question 24b, this would mean that an overview EIS would be prepared for all of the energy activities reasonably foreseeable in a particular geographic area or resulting from a particular development program. This impact statement would be followed by site-specific or project-specific EIS's. The tiering process would make each EIS of greater use and meaning to the public as the plan or program develops, without duplication of the analysis prepared for the previous impact statement.

25a. Q. *When is it appropriate to use appendices instead of including information in the body of an EIS?*

A. The body of the EIS should be a succinct statement of all the information on environmental impacts and alternatives that the decisionmaker and the public need in order to make the decision and to ascertain that every significant factor has been examined. The EIS must explain or summarize methodologies of research and modeling and the results of research that may have been conducted to analyze impacts and alternatives.

Lengthy technical discussions of modeling methodology, baseline studies, or other work are best reserved for the appendix. In other words, if only technically trained individuals are likely to understand a particular discussion, then it should go in the appendix, and a plain language summary of the analysis and conclusions of that technical discussion should go in the text of the EIS.

The final statement must also contain the agency's responses to comments on the draft EIS. These responses will be primarily in the form of changes in the document itself, but specific answers to each significant comment should also be included. These specific responses may be placed in an appendix. If the comments are especially voluminous, summaries of the comments and responses will suffice. (See Question 29 regarding the level of detail required for response to comments.)

25b. Q. *How does an appendix differ from incorporation by reference?*

A. First, if at all possible, the appendix accompanies the EIS, whereas the material which is incorporated by reference does not accompany the EIS. Thus, the appendix should contain information that reviewers will be likely to want to examine. The appendix should include material that pertains to preparation of a particular EIS. Research papers directly relevant to the proposal, lists of affected species, discussion of the methodology of models used in the analysis of impacts, extremely detailed responses to comments, or other information, would be placed in the appendix.

The appendix must be complete and available at the time the EIS is filed. Five copies of the appendix must be sent to EPA with five copies of the EIS for filing. If the appendix is too bulky to be circulated, it instead must be placed in conveniently accessible locations or furnished directly to commentors upon request. If it is not circulated with the EIS, the Notice of Availability published by EPA must so state, giving a telephone number to enable potential commentors to locate or request copies of the appendix promptly.

Material that is not directly related to preparation of the EIS should be incorporated by reference. This would include other EIS's, research papers in the general literature, technical background papers or other material that someone with technical training could use to evaluate the analysis of the proposal. These must be made available, either by citing the literature, furnishing copies to central locations, or sending copies directly to commentors upon request.

Care must be taken in all cases to ensure that material incorporated by reference, and the occasional appendix that does not accompany the EIS, are in fact available for the full minimum public comment period.

26a. Q. *How detailed must an EIS index be?*

A. The EIS index should have a level of detail sufficient to focus on areas of the EIS of reasonable interest to any reader. It cannot be restricted to the most important topics. On the other hand, it need not identify every conceivable term or phrase in the EIS. If an agency believes that the reader is reasonably likely to be interested in a topic, it should be included.

26b. Q. *Is a keyword index required?*

A. No. A keyword index is a relatively short list of descriptive terms that identifies the key concepts or subject areas in a document. For example, it could consist of 20 terms which describe the most significant aspects of an EIS that a future research would need — type of proposal, type of impacts, type of environment, geographical area, sampling or modeling methodologies used. This technique permits the compilation of EIS data banks by facilitating quick and inexpensive access to stored materials. While a keyword index is not required by the regulations, it could be a useful addition for several reasons. First, it can be useful as a quick index for reviewers of the EIS, helping to focus on areas of interest. Second, if an agency keeps a listing of the keyword indexes of the EIS's it produces, the EIS preparers themselves will have quick access to similar research data and methodologies to aid their future EIS work. Third, a keyword index will be needed to make an EIS available to future researchers using EIS data banks that are being developed. Preparation of such an index now when the document is produced will save a later effort when the data banks become operational.

27a. Q. *If a consultant is used in preparing an EIS, must the list of preparers identify members of the consulting firm as well as the agency NEPA staff who were primarily responsible?*

A. Section 1502.17 requires identification of the names and qualifications of persons who were primarily responsible for preparing the EIS or significant background papers, including basic components of the statement. This means that members of a consulting firm preparing

material that is to become part of the EIS must be identified. The EIS should identify these individuals even though the consultant's contribution may have been modified by the agency.

27b. Q. *Should agency staff involved in reviewing and editing the EIS also be included in the list of preparers?*

A. Agency personnel who wrote basic components of the EIS or significant background papers must, of course, be identified. The EIS should also list the technical editors who reviewed or edited the statements.

27c. Q. *How much information should be included on each person listed?*

A. The list of preparers should normally not exceed two pages. Therefore, agencies must determine which individuals had primary responsibility and need not identify individuals with minor involvement. The list of preparers should include a very brief identification of the individuals involved, their qualifications (expertise, professional disciplines), and the specific portion of the EIS for which they are responsible. This may be done in tabular form to cut down on length. A line or two for each person's qualifications should be sufficient.

28. Q. *May an agency file xerox copies of an EIS with EPA pending the completion of printing the document?*

A. Xerox copies of an EIS may be filed with EPA prior to printing only if the xerox copies are simultaneously made available to other agencies and the public. Section 1506.9 of the regulations, which governs EIS filing, specifically requires Federal agencies to file EIS's with EPA no earlier than the EIS is distributed to the public. However, this section does not prohibit xeroxing as a form of reproduction and distribution. When an agency chooses xeroxing as the reproduction method, the EIS must be clear and legible to permit ease of reading and ultimate microficheing of the EIS. Where color graphs are important to the EIS, they should be reproduced and circulated with the xeroxed copy.

29a. Q. *What response must an agency provide to a comment on a draft EIS which states that the EIS's methodology is inadequate or inadequately explained? For example, what level of detail must an agency include in its response to a simple postcard comment making such an allegation?*

A. Appropriate responses to comments are described in Section 1503.4. Normally, the responses should result in changes in the text of the EIS, not simply a separate answer at the back of the document. But, in addition, the agency must state what its response was, and if the agency decides that no substantive response to a comment is necessary, it must explain briefly why.

An agency is not under an obligation to issue a lengthy reiteration of its methodology for any portion of an EIS if the only comment addressing the methodology is a simple complaint that the EIS methodology is inadequate. But agencies must respond to comments, however brief, which are specific in their criticism of agency methodology. For example, if a commentator on an EIS said that an agency's air quality dispersion analysis or methodology was inadequate, and the agency had included a discussion of that analysis in the EIS, little if anything need be added in response to such a comment. However, if the commentator said that the dispersion analysis was inadequate because of its use of a certain computational technique, or that a

dispersion analysis was inadequately explained because computational techniques were not included or referenced, then the agency would have to respond in a substantive and meaningful way to such a comment.

If a number of comments are identical or very similar, agencies may group the comments and prepare a single answer for each group. Comments may be summarized if they are especially voluminous. The comments or summaries must be attached to the EIS regardless of whether the agency believes they merit individual discussion in the body of the final EIS.

29b. Q. *How must an agency respond to a comment on a draft EIS that raises a new alternative not previously considered in the draft EIS?*

A. This question might arise in several possible situations. First, a commentor on a draft EIS may indicate that there is a possible alternative which, in the agency's view, is not a reasonable alternative. Section 1502.14(a). If that is the case, the agency must explain why the comment does not warrant further agency response, citing authorities or reasons that support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response. Section 1503.4(a). For example, a commentor on a draft EIS on a coal-fired power plant may suggest the alternative of using synthetic fuel. The agency may reject the alternative with a brief discussion (with authorities) of the unavailability of synthetic fuel within the time frame necessary to meet the need and purpose of the proposed facility.

A second possibility is that an agency may receive a comment indicating that a particular alternative, while reasonable, should be modified somewhat, for example, to achieve certain mitigation benefits or for other reasons. If the modification is reasonable, the agency should include a discussion of it in the final EIS. For example, a commentor on a draft EIS on a proposal for a pumped storage power facility might suggest that the applicant's proposed alternative should be enhanced by the addition of certain reasonable mitigation measures, including the purchase and set-aside of a wildlife preserve to substitute for the tract to be destroyed by the project. The modified alternative including the additional mitigation measures should be discussed by the agency in the final EIS.

A third slightly different possibility is that a comment on a draft EIS will raise an alternative which is a minor variation of one of the alternatives discussed in the draft EIS, but this variation was not given any consideration by the agency. In such a case, the agency should develop and evaluate the new alternative, if it is reasonable, in the final EIS. If it is qualitatively within the spectrum of alternatives that were discussed in the draft, a supplemental draft will not be needed. For example, a commentor on a draft EIS to designate a wilderness area within a National Forest might reasonably identify a specific tract of the forest and urge that it be considered for designation. If the draft EIS considered designation of a range of alternative tracts which encompassed forest area of similar quality and quantity, no supplemental EIS would have to be prepared. The agency could fulfill its obligation by addressing that specific alternative in the final EIS.

As another example, an EIS on an urban housing project may analyze the alternatives of constructing 2000, 4000, or 6000 units. A commentor on the draft EIS might urge the consideration of constructing 5000 units utilizing a different configuration of buildings. This alternative is within the spectrum of alternatives already considered and, therefore, could be addressed in the final EIS.

A fourth possibility is that a commentor points out an alternative which is not a variation of the proposal or of any alternative discussed in the draft impact statement and is a reasonable alternative that warrants serious agency response. In such a case, the agency must issue a supplement to the draft EIS that discusses this new alternative. For example, a commentor on a draft EIS on a nuclear power plant might suggest that a reasonable alternative for meeting the projected need for power would be through peak load management and energy conservation programs. If the permitting agency has failed to consider that approach in the Draft EIS, and the approach cannot be dismissed by the agency as unreasonable, a supplement to the Draft EIS, which discusses that alternative, must be prepared. (If necessary, the same supplement should also discuss substantial changes in the proposed action or significant new circumstances or information, as required by Section 1502.9(c)(1) of the Council's regulations.)

If the new alternative was not raised by the commentor during scoping, but could have been, commentors may find that they are unpersuasive in their efforts to have their suggested alternative analyzed in detail by the agency. However, if the new alternative is discovered or developed later, and it could not reasonably have been raised during the scoping process, then the agency must address it in a supplemental draft EIS. The agency is, in any case, ultimately responsible for preparing an adequate EIS that considers all reasonable alternatives.

30. Q. *When a cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law intends to adopt a lead agency's EIS and it is not satisfied with the adequacy of the document, may the cooperating agency adopt only the part of the EIS with which it is satisfied? If so, would a cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law have to prepare a separate EIS or EIS supplement covering the areas of disagreement with the lead agency?*

A. Generally, a cooperating agency may adopt a lead agency's EIS without recirculating it if it concludes that its NEPA requirements and its comments and suggestions have been satisfied. Section 1506.3(a), (c). If necessary, a cooperating agency may adopt only a portion of the lead agency's EIS and may reject that part of the EIS with which it disagrees stating publicly why it did so. Section 1506.3(a).

A cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law (e.g., an agency with independent legal responsibilities with respect to the proposal) has an independent legal obligation to comply with NEPA. Therefore, if the cooperating agency determines that the EIS is wrong or inadequate, it must prepare a supplement to the EIS, replacing or adding any needed information, and must circulate the supplement as a draft for public and agency review and comment. A final supplemental EIS would be required before the agency could take action. The adopted portions of the lead agency EIS should be circulated with the supplement. Section 1506.3(b). A cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law will have to prepare its own Record of Decision for its action, in which it must explain how it reached its conclusions. Each agency should explain how and why its conclusions differ, if that is the case, from those of other agencies which issued their Records of Decision earlier.

An agency that did not cooperate in preparation of an EIS may also adopt an EIS or portion thereof. But this would arise only in rare instances, because an agency adopting an EIS for use in its own decision normally would have been a cooperating agency. If the proposed action for which the EIS was prepared is substantially the same as the proposed action of the adopting agency, the EIS may be adopted as long as it is recirculated as a final EIS and the

agency announces what it is doing. This would be followed by the 30-day review period and issuance of a Record of Decision by the adopting agency. If the proposed action by the adopting agency is not substantially the same as that in the EIS (i.e., if an EIS on one action is being adapted for use in a decision on another action), the EIS would be treated as a draft and circulated for the normal public comment period and other procedures. Section 1506.3(b).

31a. Q. *Do the Council's NEPA regulations apply to independent regulatory agencies like the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission?*

A. The statutory requirements of NEPA's Section 102 apply to "all agencies of the federal government." The NEPA regulations implement the procedural provisions of NEPA as set forth in NEPA's Section 102(2) for all agencies of the federal government. The NEPA regulations apply to independent regulatory agencies; however, they do not direct independent regulatory agencies or other agencies to make decisions in any particular way or in a way inconsistent with an agency's statutory charter. Sections 1500.3, 1500.6, 1507.1 and 1507.3.

31b. Q. *Can an Executive Branch agency like the Department of the Interior adopt an EIS prepared by an independent regulatory agency such as FERC?*

A. If an independent regulatory agency such as FERC has prepared an EIS in connection with its approval of a proposed project, an Executive Branch agency (e.g., the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior) may, in accordance with Section 1506.3, adopt the EIS or a portion thereof for its use in considering the same proposal. In such a case, the EIS must, to the satisfaction of the adopting agency, meet the standards for an adequate statement under the NEPA regulations (including scope and quality of analysis of alternatives) and must satisfy the adopting agency's comments and suggestions. If the independent regulatory agency fails to comply with the NEPA regulations, the cooperating or adopting agency may find that it is unable to adopt the EIS, thus, forcing the preparation of a new EIS or EIS Supplement for the same action. The NEPA regulations were made applicable to all federal agencies in order to avoid this result and to achieve uniform application and efficiency of the NEPA process.

32. Q. *Under what circumstances do old EIS's have to be supplemented before taking action on a proposal?*

A. As a rule of thumb, if the proposal has not yet been implemented, or if the EIS concerns an ongoing program, EIS's that are more than five years old should be carefully re-examined to determine if the criteria in Section 1502.9 compel preparation of an EIS supplement.

If an agency has made a substantial change in a proposed action that is relevant to environmental concerns, or if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts, a supplemental EIS must be prepared for an old EIS so that the agency has the best possible information to make any necessary substantive changes in its decisions regarding the proposal. Section 1502.9(c).

- 33a. Q. *When must a referral of an interagency disagreement be made to the Council?*
- A. The Council's referral procedure is a pre-decision referral process for interagency disagreements. Hence, Section 1504.3 requires that a referring agency must deliver its referral to the Council not later than 25 days after publication by EPA of notice that the final EIS is available (unless the lead agency grants an extension of time under Section 1504.3(b)).
- 33b. Q. *May a referral be made after the issuance of a Record of Decision?*
- A. No, except for cases where agencies provide an internal appeal procedure which permits simultaneous filing of the final EIS and the record of decision (ROD). Section 1506.10(b)(2). Otherwise, as stated above, the process is a pre-decision referral process. Referrals must be made within 25 days after the notice of availability of the final EIS, whereas the final decision (ROD) may not be made or filed until after 30 days from the notice of availability of the EIS. Sections 1504.3(b), 1506.10(b). If a lead agency has granted an extension of time for another agency to take action on a referral, the ROD may not be issued until the extension has expired.
- 34a. Q. *Must Records of Decision (ROD's) be made public? How should they be made available?*
- A. Under the regulations, agencies must prepare a "concise public record of decision," which contains the elements specified in Section 1505.2. This public record may be integrated into any other decision record prepared by the agency, or it may be separate if decision documents are not normally made public. The Record of Decision is intended by the Council to be an environmental document (even though it is not explicitly mentioned in the definition of "environmental document" in Section 1508.10). Therefore, it must be made available to the public through appropriate public notice as required by Section 1506.6(b). However, there is no specific requirement for publication of the ROD itself, either in the Federal Register or elsewhere.
- 34b. Q. *May the summary section in the final Environmental Impact Statement substitute for or constitute an agency's Record of Decision?*
- A. No. An environmental impact statement is supposed to inform the decisionmaker before the decision is made. Sections 1502.1, 1505.2. The Council's regulations provide for a 30-day period after notice is published that the final EIS has been filed with EPA before the agency make take final action. During that period, in addition to the agency's own internal final review, the public and other agencies can comment on the final EIS prior to the agency's final action on the proposal. In addition, the Council's regulations make clear that the requirements for the summary in an EIS are not the same as the requirements for a ROD. Sections 1502.12 and 1505.2.
- 34c. Q. *What provisions should Records of Decision contain pertaining to mitigation and monitoring?*
- A. Lead agencies "shall include appropriate conditions [including mitigation measures and monitoring and enforcement programs] in grants, permits or other approvals" and shall "condition funding of actions on mitigation." Section 1505.3. Any such measures that are adopted must be explained and committed in the ROD.

The reasonable alternative mitigation measures and monitoring programs should have been addressed in the draft and final EIS. The discussion of mitigation and monitoring in a Record of Decision must be more detailed than a general statement that mitigation is being required, but not so detailed as to duplicate discussion of mitigation in the EIS. The Record of Decision should contain a concise summary identification of the mitigation measures which the agency has committed itself to adopt.

The Record of Decision must also state whether all practicable mitigation measures have been adopted, and if not, why not. Section 1505.2(c). The Record of Decision must identify the mitigation measures and monitoring and enforcement programs that have been selected and plainly indicate that they are adopted as part of the agency's decision. If the proposed action is the issuance of a permit or other approval, the specific details of the mitigation measures shall then be included as appropriate conditions in whatever grants, permits, funding or other approvals are being made by the federal agency. Section 1505.3(a), (b). If the proposal is to be carried out by the federal agency itself, the Record of Decision should delineate the mitigation and monitoring measures in sufficient detail to constitute an enforceable commitment or incorporate by reference the portions of the EIS that do so.

34d. Q. *What is the enforceability of a Record of Decision?*

A. Pursuant to generally recognized principles of federal administrative law, agencies will be held accountable for preparing Records of Decision that conform to the decisions actually made and for carrying out the actions set forth in the Records of Decision. This is based on the principle that an agency must comply with its own decisions and regulations once they are adopted. Thus, the terms of a Record of Decision are enforceable by agencies and private parties. A Record of Decision can be used to compel compliance with or execution of the mitigation measures identified therein.

35. Q. *How long should the NEPA process take to complete?*

A. When an EIS is required, the process obviously will take longer than when an EA is the only document prepared. But the Council's NEPA regulations encourage streamlined review, adoption of deadlines, elimination of duplicative work, eliciting suggested alternatives and other comments early through scoping, cooperation among agencies, and consultation with applicants during project planning. The Council has advised agencies that under the new NEPA regulations even large, complex energy projects would require only about 12 months for the completion of the entire EIS process. For most major actions, this period is well within the planning time that is needed in any event, apart from NEPA.

The time required for the preparation of program EIS's may be greater. The Council also recognizes that some projects will entail difficult long-term planning and/or the acquisition of certain data which of necessity will require more time for the preparation of the EIS. Indeed, some proposals should be given more time for the thoughtful preparation of an EIS and development of a decision which fulfills NEPA's substantive goals.

For cases in which only an environmental assessment will be prepared, the NEPA process should take no more than 3 months and, in many cases, substantially less, as part of the normal analysis and approval process for the action.

36a. Q. *How long and detailed must an environmental assessment (EA) be?*

- A. The environmental assessment is a concise public document which has three defined functions: (1) It briefly provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an EIS; (2) it aids an agency's compliance with NEPA when no EIS is necessary (i.e., it helps to identify better alternatives and mitigation measures); and (3) it facilitates preparation of an EIS when one is necessary. Section 1508.9(a).

Since the EA is a concise document, it should not contain long descriptions of detailed data which the agency may have gathered. Rather, it should contain a brief discussion of the need for the proposal, alternatives to the proposal, the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and a list of agencies and persons consulted. Section 1508.9(b).

While the regulations do not contain page limits for EA's, the Council has generally advised agencies to keep the length of EA's to not more than approximately 10-15 pages. Some agencies expressly provide page guidelines (e.g., 10-15 pages in the case of the Army Corps). To avoid undue length, the EA may incorporate by reference background data to support its concise discussion of the proposal and relevant issues.

36b. Q. *Under what circumstances is a lengthy EA appropriate?*

- A. Agencies should avoid preparing lengthy EA's except in unusual cases where a proposal is so complex that a concise document cannot meet the goals of Section 1508.9 and where it is extremely difficult to determine whether the proposal could have significant environmental effects. In most cases, however, a lengthy EA indicates that an EIS is needed.

37a. Q. *What is the level of detail of information that must be included in a finding of no significant impact (FONSI)?*

- A. The FONSI is a document in which the agency briefly explains the reasons why an action will not have a significant effect on the human environment and, therefore, why an EIS will not be prepared. Section 1508.13. The finding itself need not be detailed but must succinctly state the reasons for deciding that the action will have no significant environmental effects and, if relevant, must show which factors were weighted most heavily in the determination. In addition to this statement, the FONSI must include, summarize, or attach and incorporate by reference the environmental assessment.

37b. Q. *What are the criteria for deciding whether a FONSI should be made available for public review for 30 days before the agency's final determination whether to prepare an EIS?*

- A. Public review is necessary, for example, (a) if the proposal is a borderline case; i.e., when there is a reasonable argument for preparation of an EIS; (b) if it is an unusual case, a new kind of action, or a precedent setting case such as a first intrusion of even a minor development into a pristine area; (c) when there is either scientific or public controversy over the proposal; or (d) when it involves a proposal which is or is closely similar to one which normally requires preparation of an EIS. Section 1501.4(e)(2), 1508.27. Agencies also must allow a period of public review of the FONSI if the proposed action would be located in a floodplain or wetland. E.O. 11988, Section 2(a)(4); E.O. 11990, Section 2(b).

38. Q. *Must EA's and FONSI's be made public? If so, how should this be done?*

A. Yes, they must be available to the public. Section 1506.6 requires agencies to involve the public in implementing their NEPA procedures, and this includes public involvement in the preparation of EA's and FONSI's. These are public "environmental documents" under Section 1506.6(b) and, therefore, agencies must give public notice of their availability. A combination of methods may be used to give notice, and the methods should be tailored to the needs of particular cases. Thus, a Federal Register notice of availability of the documents, coupled with notices in national publications and mailed to interested national groups, might be appropriate for proposals that are national in scope. Local newspaper notices may be more appropriate for regional or site-specific proposals.

The objective, however, is to notify all interested or affected parties. If this is not being achieved, then the methods should be re-evaluated and changed. Repeated failure to reach the interested or affected public would be interpreted as a violation of the regulations.

39. Q. *Can an EA and FONSI be used to impose enforceable mitigation measures, monitoring programs, or other requirements, even though there is no requirement in the regulations in such cases for a formal Record of Decision?*

A. Yes. In cases where an environmental assessment is the appropriate environmental document, there still may be mitigation measures or alternatives that would be desirable to consider and adopt even though the impacts of the proposal will not be "significant." In such cases, the EA should include a discussion of these measures or alternatives to "assist agency planning and decisionmaking" and to "aid an agency's compliance with [NEPA] when no environmental impact statement is necessary." Section 1501.3(b), 1508.9(a)(2). The appropriate mitigation measures can be imposed as enforceable permit conditions, or adopted as part of the agency final decision in the same manner mitigation measures are adopted in the formal Record of Decision that is required in EIS cases.

40. Q. *If an environmental assessment indicates that the environmental effects of a proposal are significant but that, with mitigation, those effects may be reduced to less than significant levels, may the agency make a finding of no significant impact rather than prepare an EIS? Is that a legitimate function of an EA and scoping?*

A. Mitigation measures may be relied upon to make a finding of no significant impact only if they are imposed by statute or regulation or submitted by an applicant or agency as part of the original proposal. As a general rule, the regulations contemplate that agencies should use a broad approach in defining significance and should not rely on the possibility of mitigation as an excuse to avoid the EIS requirement. Sections 1508.8, 1508.27.

If a proposal appears to have adverse effects which would be significant, and certain mitigation measures are then developed during the scoping or EA stages, the existence of such possible mitigation does not obviate the need for an EIS. Therefore, if scoping or the EA identifies certain mitigation possibilities without altering the nature of the overall proposal itself, the agency should continue the EIS process and submit the proposal, and the potential mitigation, for public and agency review and comment. This is essential to ensure that the final decision is based on all the relevant factors and that the full NEPA process will result in enforceable mitigation measure through the Record of Decision.

In some instances, where the proposal itself so integrates mitigation from the beginning that it is impossible to define the proposal without including the mitigation, the agency may then rely on the mitigation measures in determining that the overall effects would not be significant (e.g., where an application for a permit for a small hydro dam is based on a binding commitment to build fish ladders, to permit adequate downstream flow, and to replace any lost wetlands, wildlife habitat and recreational potential). In those instances, agencies should make the FONSI and EA available for 30 days of public comment before taking action. Section 1501.4(e)(2).

Similarly, scoping may result in a redefinition of the entire project, as a result of mitigation proposals. In that case, the agency may alter its previous decisions to do an EIS, as long as the agency or applicant resubmits the entire proposal, and the EA and FONSI are available for 30 days of review and comment. One example of this would be where the size and location of a proposed industrial park are changed to avoid affecting a nearby wetland area.

Section 4(f) Background

History

Section 4(f) has been part of Federal law in some form since 1966. It was enacted as Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966 (hence the reference to “Section 4(f)”). Section 4(f) was originally set forth in Title 49, United States Code (U.S.C.), Section 1653(f), and applies only to agencies within the DOT. Also, in 1966, a similar provision was added to Title 23, U.S.C., Section 138. Between 1966 and 1968, the wording in the two provisions was somewhat different. This led to some confusion since Section 4(f) applied to all programs of DOT, whereas Section 138 applied only to the Federal-Aid Highway Program. Consequently, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, amended the wording in both sections to be substantially consistent. Except for the last sentence of the second paragraph (which appears only in Section 138), the two sections read:

“It is hereby declared to be the national policy that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. The Secretary of Transportation shall cooperate and consult with the Secretaries of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture, and with the States in developing transportation plans and programs that include measures to maintain or enhance the natural beauty of the lands traversed.

After the effective date of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, the Secretary shall not approve any program or project which requires the use of any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, State, or local significance as determined by the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction thereof, or any land from an historic site of national, State, or local significance as so determined by such officials unless (1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land, and (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to such park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic sites resulting from such use. In carrying out the national policy declared in this Section, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior and appropriate State and local officials, is authorized to conduct studies as to the most feasible Federal-aid routes for the movement of motor vehicular traffic through or around national parks so as to best serve the needs of the traveling public while preserving the natural beauty of these areas.”

In January 1983, as part of an overall recodification of the DOT Act, Section 4(f) was amended and codified in 49 U.S.C., Section 303. The wording in Section 303 reads as follows:

- (a) It is the policy of the United States Government that special effort be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.

- (b) The Secretary of Transportation shall cooperate and consult with the Secretaries of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture, and with the States, in developing transportation plans and programs that include measures to maintain or enhance the natural beauty of lands crossed by transportation activities or facilities.
- (c) The Secretary may approve a transportation program or project requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or land of an historic site of national, State, or local significance (as determined by the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, recreation area, refuge, or site) only if:
 - (1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and
 - (2) the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.

Section 138 was not amended, so the wording in the two sections is once again different. The legislative history of the 1983 recodification indicates that no substantive change was intended. Further, because of familiarity with Section 4(f) by thousands of Federal and State personnel, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) continues to refer to the requirements as Section 4(f).

The statute does not establish any procedures for preparing Section 4(f) documents, for circulating them, or for coordinating them with other agencies. The statute does not require the preparation of any written document, but the FHWA has developed procedures for the preparation, circulation, and coordination of Section 4(f) documents. The purpose of these procedures is to establish an administrative record of the basis for determining that there is no feasible and prudent alternative, and to obtain informed input from knowledgeable sources on feasible and prudent alternatives and on measures to minimize harm.

Numerous legal decisions on Section 4(f) have resulted in a DOT policy that conclusions on no feasible and prudent alternatives and on all possible planning to minimize harm must be well documented and supported. The Supreme Court in the Overton Park case (Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402 (1971)) ruled that determinations on no feasible and prudent alternative must find that there are unique problems or unusual factors involved in the use of alternatives or that the cost, environmental impacts, or community disruption resulting from such alternatives reach extraordinary magnitudes.

Purpose of this Paper

Since the enactment of Section 4(f) in 1966, courts have made several interpretations of how this statute should be applied. From these court interpretations and many years of project-by-project applications, FHWA has developed numerous policy positions on various aspects of the Section 4(f) requirements. This paper presents these various policy positions. This paper addresses only the programs and activities administered by FHWA and serves as a guide for the applicability of Section 4(f) for project situations most often encountered. For specific projects that do not completely fit the situations described in this paper, contact the Regional Office or Washington Headquarters.

Important Points

A few points should be noted at the outset. Section 4(f) applies to all historic sites, but only to publicly owned public parks, recreational areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges. When parks, recreational areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges are owned by private institutions and individuals, even if such areas are open to the public, Section 4(f) does not apply. The FHWA does, however, strongly encourage the preservation of such privately owned lands. If a governmental body has a proprietary interest in the land (such as fee ownership, drainage easement, or wetland easement), it can be considered “publicly owned.”

When projects are litigated, Section 4(f) has been a frequent issue. Therefore, it is essential that the following are completely documented: (1) the applicability/nonapplicability of Section 4(f); (2) the coordination efforts with the official(s) having jurisdiction over or administering the land (relative to significance of the land, primary use of the land, mitigation measures, etc.); (3) the location and design alternatives that would avoid or minimize harm to the Section 4(f) land; and (4) all measures to minimize harm, such as design and landscaping.

There are often concurrent requirements of other Federal agencies when Section 4(f) lands are involved in highway projects. Examples include compatibility determinations for the use of lands in the National Wildlife Refuge System and the National Park System, consistency determinations for the use of public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, determinations of direct and adverse effects for Wild and Scenic Rivers under the jurisdiction of such agencies as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service, and approval of land conversions covered by the Federal-aid in Fish Restoration and the Federal-Aid in Wildlife Restoration Acts (the Dingell-Johnson and Pittman-Robertson Acts), the Recreational Demonstration Projects and the Federal Property and Administrative Service (Surplus Property) Acts, and Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The mitigation plan developed for the project should include measures that would satisfy the requirements for these determinations and for Section 4(f) approval. When Federal lands, which are needed for highway projects are not subject to Section 4(f), there is still a need for close coordination with the Federal agency owning or administering the land in order to develop a mitigation plan that would satisfy any other requirements for a land transfer.

Section 4(f) Evaluation

When a project uses land protected by Section 4(f), a Section 4(f) evaluation must be prepared. The following information provides guidance on the key areas of a Section 4(f) evaluation.

Alternatives

The intent of the Section 4(f) statute and the policy of the Department of Transportation is to avoid public parks, recreation areas, refuges, and historic sites. In order to demonstrate that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of Section 4(f) land, the evaluation must address location alternatives and design shifts that avoid the Section 4(f) land. Supporting information must demonstrate that such alternatives result in unique problems. Unique problems are present when there are truly unusual factors or when the costs or community disruption reach extraordinary magnitude.

When making a finding that an alternative is not feasible and prudent, it is not necessary to show that any single factor presents unique problems. Adverse factors such as environmental impacts, safety and geometric problems, decreased traffic service, increased costs, and any other factors may be considered collectively. A cumulation of problems such as these may be a sufficient reason to use a 4(f) property, but only if it creates truly unique problems.

In applying the standard of “unique problems,” the nature, quality, and effect of the taking of the 4(f) property may be considered to show that there are truly unusual factors, or cost or community disruption of extraordinary magnitude. Thus, the net impact of any build, no-build, or mitigation alternative on both the 4(f) property and the surrounding area or community must be considered. This may include the mitigation opportunities presented by an alternative (which uses some 4(f) property) that would reduce or eliminate the impact on the 4(f) property. Not all uses of 4(f) property have the same magnitude of effect and not all 4(f) properties being used have the same quality. For example, evaluation of net impact may consider whether the use of the 4(f) property involves (1) a large taking or a small taking (2) shaving an edge of its property or cutting through the middle, (3) altering part of the land surrounding an historic building or removing the building itself, or (4) an unused portion of a park or a highly used portion.

Care should be taken that consistent standards are applied throughout the length of any given project. For example, it would be inconsistent to accept a restricted roadway cross section (with a jersey barrier in the median or substandard width shoulders) for a highway over a drainage structure or for a bridge in order to reduce the project cost when at other locations on the same project (or similar projects) this roadway cross section is rejected as unacceptable in order to avoid a park.

The Section 4(f) evaluation must address the purpose and need of the project. This discussion must support the project termini and the types of alternatives, e.g., new location or modification of the existing alignment, that would satisfy the need for the project. That need must be sufficiently explained to show that the no-build alternative and any alternative that does not serve the need result in unique problems, i.e., truly unusual factors or cost or community disruption that reach extraordinary magnitude and are therefore not prudent and feasible. Theoretically, there may be an unlimited number of alternatives that satisfy the need, but it is not necessary to examine all. The evaluation of alternatives must demonstrate a reasoned methodology for narrowing the field of alternatives to a number sufficient to support a sound judgment that the study of additional variations is not worthwhile.

If all the “build” alternatives use some Section 4(f) land, the alternative which has the least overall impact to Section 4(f) resources must be selected unless it is not feasible and prudent. For example, Table 1 shows the results of an analysis for two projects. On Project 1, Alternative D must be selected since it is feasible and prudent and does not use Section 4(f) land. On Project 2, Alternative B must be selected since (1) Alternative D, which avoids the Section 4(f) land is not feasible and prudent and (2) of the remaining alternatives that use Section 4(f) land, Alternative B has the least impact (after mitigation) on Section 4(f) land. The above analysis must be used when eliminating alternatives from further consideration regardless of when they are dropped in the project development process.

TABLE 1

Project	Alternative	Feasible and Prudent	Uses Section 4(f) Land	Harm to Section 4(f) Land (after mitigation)
1	A	Yes	Yes	Greatest
	B	Yes	Yes	Least
	C	Yes	Yes	Medium
	D	Yes	No	None
2	A	Yes	Yes	Greatest
	B	Yes	Yes	Least
	C	Yes	Yes	Medium
	D	No	No	None

If a project includes the demolition of a historic bridge, the following alternatives must have been considered and found not feasible and prudent:

1. Do nothing,
2. Build on new location without using the historic bridge, and
3. Rehabilitation without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge.

There have been many projects where it is feasible and prudent to build on new location but it is not feasible and prudent to preserve the existing bridge. This could occur (1) when the historic bridge is

beyond rehabilitation for a transportation or an alternative use; (2) when no responsible party can be located, through a marketing effort, to maintain and preserve the historic features of the bridge; or (3) when a permitting authority, such as the Coast Guard, requires removal or demolition of the historic bridge.

Mitigation

The statute and the FHWA regulation require all possible planning to minimize harm. All possible planning to minimize harm (i.e., mitigation measures) should be determined through consultation with the official of the agency owning or administering the land. Note that neither the Section 4(f) statute nor the FHWA Section 4(f) regulation require the replacement of Section 4(f) land used for highway projects. However, mitigation measures (other than design modifications in the project to lessen the impact on Section 4(f) land) involving parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges will usually entail replacement of land and facilities (of comparable value and function) or monetary compensation which could be used to enhance the remaining land. Mitigation of historic sites usually consist of those measures necessary to preserve the historic integrity of the site and agreed to, in accordance with 36 CFR, Part 800, by the FHWA, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and, as appropriate, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). The cost of mitigation should be a reasonable public expenditure in light of the severity of the impact on the Section 4(f) resource.

State and local governments often obtain grants through the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to acquire or make improvements to parks and recreation areas. Section 6(f) of this Act prohibits the conversion of property acquired or developed with these grants to a nonrecreational purpose without the approval of the Department of the Interior's (DOI) National Park Service,. Section 6(f) directs DOI to assure that replacement lands of equal value, location and usefulness are provided as conditions to such conversions. Consequently, where conversions of Section 6(f) lands are proposed for highway projects, replacement lands will be necessary. Regardless of the mitigation proposed, the Section 4(f) evaluation should document the National Park Service's tentative position relative to Section 6(f) conversion.

Coordination

Preliminary coordination prior to the circulation of the draft Section 4(f) evaluation should be accomplished with the official of the agency owning or administering the land, the DOI and, as appropriate, the Departments of Agriculture (USDA) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The preliminary coordination with DOI and HUD should be at the regional level. The preliminary coordination with USDA should be with the appropriate National Forest Supervisor. There should be coordination with USDA whenever a project uses land from the National Forest System. Since the Housing and Urban Rural Recovery Act of 1983 repealed the use restrictions for the Neighborhood Facilities Program authorized by Title VII of the HUD Act of 1965 and the Open Space Program

authorized by Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, the number of instances where coordination with HUD should be accomplished has been substantially reduced. Coordination with HUD should occur whenever a project uses Section 4(f) land for/on which HUD funding (other than the above) had been utilized.

If any issues are raised by these agencies resulting from the circulation of the draft Section 4(f) evaluation, follow-up coordination must be undertaken to resolve the issues. In most cases, the agency's response will indicate a contact point for the follow-up coordination. However, case law indicates that if reasonable efforts to resolve the issues are not successful (one of these agencies is not satisfied with the way its concerns were addressed) and the issues were disclosed and received good-faith attention from the decision makers, we have met our procedural obligation under Section 4(f) to consult with and obtain the agency's comments. Section 4(f) does not require more.

Format and Approval

The Section 4(f) evaluation may be incorporated as an element of an environmental assessment/finding of no significant impact (EA/FONSI) or environmental impact statement (EIS). However, the Section 4(f) evaluation must be presented in a separate section. All Section 4(f) evaluations are approved at the Regional Office. If the Section 4(f) evaluation is contained in an EIS, the Region will make the Section 4(f) approval either in its approval of the final EIS or in the Record of Decision (ROD). In those cases where the Section 4(f) approval is made in the final EIS, the basis for the Section 4(f) approval will be summarized in the ROD.

Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluations

As an alternative to preparing an individual Section 4(f) evaluation, FHWA may, in certain circumstances, have the option of applying a programmatic evaluation. Under a programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation, certain conditions are laid out such that, if a project meets the conditions, it will satisfy the requirements of Section 4(f) that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives and that there has been all possible planning to minimize harm. These conditions generally relate to the type of project, the severity of impacts to Section 4(f) property, the evaluation of alternatives, the establishment of a procedure for minimizing harm to the Section 4(f) property, and adequate coordination with appropriate entities. Programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations can be nationwide, regionwide, or statewide.

There are four nationwide programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations. One covers projects that use historic bridges. The second covers projects that use minor amounts of land from public parks, recreation areas and wildlife and waterfowl refuges. The third covers projects that use minor amounts of land from historic sites. The fourth covers bikeway projects.

The fact that the Nationwide programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations are approved does not mean that these types of projects are exempt from or have advance compliance with the requirements of Section 4(f). Section 4(f) does, in fact, apply to each of the types of projects addressed by the programmatic evaluations. Furthermore, the programmatic Section 4(f) does not relax the Section 4(f) standards; i.e., it is just as difficult to justify using Section 4(f) land with the programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation as it is with an individual Section 4(f) evaluation.

These programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations may be applied only to projects meeting the applicability criteria. How the project meets the applicability criteria must be documented. The documentation needed to support the conclusions required by the programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation would be comparable to the documentation needed for an individual Section 4(f) evaluation.

These programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations streamline the amount of interagency coordination that is required for an individual Section 4(f) evaluation. Interagency coordination is required only with the official(s) with jurisdiction and not with DOI, USDA, or HUD (unless the Federal agency has a specific action to take, such as DOI approval of a conversion of land acquired using Land and Water Conservation Funds).

Section 4(f) Applicability

The following questions and answers provide guidance on the applicability of Section 4(f) to various types of land. The examples used describe the situations most often encountered. The BDE should be contacted for guidance on situations or issues not covered in this information.

Attachment 2 identifies areas of disagreement between the FHWA and the US Department of the Interior (DOI) concerning Section 4(f) applicability. FHWA has advised it will enforce its policies as outlined in the questions and answers which follow, even though DOI may have an objection.

1. Use of Land

Question A:

What constitutes a “use” of land from a publicly owned public park, recreation area, wildlife refuge, and waterfowl refuge or historic site?

Answer A:

A “use” occurs (1) when land from a Section 4(f) site is acquired for a transportation project, (2) when there is an occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the statute’s preservationist purposes, or (3) when the proximity impacts of the transportation project on the Section 4(f) site, without acquisition of land, are so great that the purposes for which the Section 4(f) site exists are substantially impaired (normally referred to by courts as a constructive use).

The following types of work do not “use” land from a Section 4(f) site provided the historic qualities of the facility will not be adversely affected: (a) modification/rehabilitation of a historic highway; and (b) maintenance/rehabilitation of a historic bridge. Such determinations should be made only after the SHPO and the ACHP have been consulted and have not objected to the finding.

Question B:

Can a transportation project, located near or adjacent to a Section 4(f) site make a “constructive use” of that site even though there is no occupancy of the site by the project? How is “constructive use” determined?

Answer B:

Yes. A constructive use of a Section 4(f) site can occur when the capability to perform any of the site’s vital functions is substantially impaired by the proximity impacts from a transportation

project. Such substantial impairment would occur when the proximity impacts to Section 4(f) lands are sufficiently serious that the value of the site in terms of its prior significance and enjoyment are substantially reduced or lost. The degree of impairment should be determined in consultation with the officials having jurisdiction over the resource. An example of such impact is excessive noise near an amphitheater. A November 12, 1985, memorandum from Mr. Ali F. Sevin, Director of the Office of Environmental Policy to the Regional Federal Highway Administrators provides a process that can be used to determine whether there is a constructive use. The FHWA policy is that a constructive use of Section 4(f) lands is possible, but because of its rarity, it should be carefully examined. If it is concluded that the proximity effects do not cause a substantial impairment, the FHWA can reasonably conclude that there is no constructive use. Project documents should, of course, contain the analysis of proximity effects and whether there is substantial impairment to a Section 4(f) resource. Except for responding to review comments in environmental documents which specifically address constructive use, the term “constructive use” need not be used. Where it is decided that there will be a constructive use, the draft Section 4(f) evaluation must be cleared with the Washington Headquarters prior to circulation.

2. Public Parks, Recreation Areas, and Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges

Question A:

When is publicly owned land considered to be a park, recreation area or wildlife and waterfowl refuges? Who makes the decision?

Answer A:

Publicly owned land is considered to be a park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge when the land has been officially designated as such or when the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the land determine that one of its major purposes or functions is for park, recreation, or refuge purposes. Incidental, secondary, occasional, or dispersed recreational activities do not constitute a major purpose. For the most part, the “officials having jurisdiction” are the officials of the agency owning or administering the land. There may be instances where the agency owning or administering the land has delegated or relinquished its authority to another agency, via an agreement on how some of its land will be used. The FHWA will review this agreement and determine which agency has authority on how the land will be used. If the authority has been delegated/relinquished to another agency, that agency must be contacted to determine the major purpose(s) of the land. After consultation and in the absence of an official designation of purpose or function by the officials having jurisdiction, the FHWA will base its decision on its own examination of the actual functions that exist.

The final decision on applicability of Section 4(f) to a particular type of land is made by FHWA. In reaching this decision, however, FHWA normally relies on the official having jurisdiction over the land to identify the kinds of activity or functions that take place.

Question B:

How should the significance of public parks, recreation areas, and waterfowl and wildlife refuges be determined?

Answer B:

“Significance” determinations (on publicly owned land considered to be park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge pursuant to Answer A above) are made by the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the land. For the most part, the “officials having jurisdiction” are officials of the agency owning or administering the land. For certain types of Section 4(f) lands, more than one agency may have jurisdiction over the site. The significance determination must consider the significance of the entire property and not just the portion of the property being used for the project. The meaning of the term “significance” for purposes of Section 4(f) should be explained to the officials having jurisdiction. Significance means that in comparing the availability and function of the recreation, park, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge area with the recreational, park, and refuge objectives of that community, the land in question plays an important role in meeting those objectives. If a determination from the official with jurisdiction cannot be obtained, the Section 4(f) land will be presumed to be significant. All determinations (whether stated or presumed) are subject to review by FHWA for reasonableness.

Question C:

Are publicly owned parks and recreation areas which are significant, but not open to the public as a whole, subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer C:

The requirements of Section 4(f) would apply if the entire public is permitted visitation at any time. Section 4(f) would not apply when visitation is permitted to only a select group and not the entire public. Examples of such groups include residents of a public housing project; military and their dependents; students of a school; and students, faculty, and alumni of a college or university. The FHWA does, however, strongly encourage the preservation of such parks and recreation areas even though they may not be open to the public at large.

Question D:

When does an easement or lease agreement with a governmental body constitute “public ownership?”

Answer D:

Case law holds that land subject to a public easement in perpetuity can be considered to be publicly owned land for the purpose which the easement exists. Under special circumstances, lease agreements may also constitute a proprietary interest in the land. Such lease agreements must be determined on a case-by-case basis, and such factors as the term of the lease, the understanding of the parties to the lease, any cancellation clauses, and the like should be considered. Any questions on whether or not a leasehold or other temporary interest constitutes public ownership should be referred to the Washington Headquarters through the Regional Office.

3. Historic Sites

Question A:

How should the significance (for Section 4(f) purposes) of historic sites be determined?

Answer A:

Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act, the FHWA in cooperation with the State highway department consults with the SHPO and, if appropriate, with local officials to determine whether a site is on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. In case of doubt or disagreement between FHWA and the SHPO, a request for determination of eligibility is made to the Keeper of the National Register. A third party may also request the Keeper for a determination of eligibility. For purposes of Section 4(f), a historic site is significant only if it is on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, unless the FHWA determines that the application of Section 4(f) is otherwise appropriate. If a historic site is determined not to be on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, but an official (such as the Mayor, President of the local historic society, etc.) provides information to indicate that the historic site is of local significance, FHWA may apply Section 4(f). In the event that Section 4(f) is found inapplicable, the FHWA Division Office should document the basis for not applying Section 4(f). Such documentation might include the reasons why the historic site was not eligible for the National Register.

Question B:

How does Section 4(f) apply to either permanent or temporary occupancy of non-historic property within a historic district but not an integral part of the historical basis for designation of the district?

Answer B:

Normally, Section 4(f) does not apply where a property is not individually historic, is not an integral part of the historic district in which it is located, and does not contribute to the factors which make the district historic. The property and the district must be carefully evaluated to determine whether or not such a property could be occupied without adversely affecting the integrity of the historic district. If the occupancy of the property adversely affects the integrity of the district, then Section 4(f) would apply. Appropriate steps (including consultation with the SHPO) should be taken to establish and document that the property is not historic, that it has no value in the context of the historic district, and its occupancy would not adversely affect the integrity of the historic district.

Question C:

If a highway project does not occupy land in a historic site or district but does cause an “adverse effect” under 36 CFR 800, do the Section 4(f) requirements apply (i.e., is there a constructive use)?

Answer C:

An “adverse effect” under 36 CFR 800 does not automatically mean that Section 4(f) applies. If the impact would not substantially impair the historic integrity of a historic site or district, Section 4(f) requirements do not apply. Whether or not the historic integrity of the historic site or district is substantially impaired should be determined in consultation with the SHPO and thoroughly documented in the project records.

4. Historic Bridge and Highways

Question A:

How does Section 4(f) apply to historic bridges and highways?

Answer A:

The Section 4(f) statute places restrictions on the use of land from historic sites for highway improvements. The statute makes no mention of historic bridges or highways which are already serving as transportation facilities. The Congress clearly did not intend to restrict the rehabilitation, repair, or improvement of historic bridges and highways if the historic integrity is not adversely affected. The FHWA has, therefore, determined that Section 4(f) would apply if a historic bridge or highway is demolished or if its historic integrity (the criteria for which the bridge was designated historic) is adversely affected due to the proposed improvement. The affect on the historic integrity is determined in consultation with the SHPO. Section 4(f) does not apply to the construction of a replacement bridge when a historic bridge is left in place and the proximity impacts of the replacement bridge do not substantially impair the historic integrity of the historic bridge.

Question B:

How do the requirements of Section 4(f) apply to donations (pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 144(o)) to a State, locality, or responsible private entity?

Answer B:

A Section 4(f) use exists when the donee cannot maintain the features that give the bridge its historic significance. In such cases, the Section 4(f) evaluation would need to establish that it is not feasible and prudent to leave the historic bridge alone. If the bridge marketing effort is unsuccessful and the bridge is to be demolished, a finding would have to be made that there is no feasible and prudent alternative.

5. Archaeological Resources

Question A:

When does Section 4(f) apply to archaeological sites?

Answer A:

Section 4(f) applies to all archaeological sites on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register and which warrant preservation in place (including those discovered during construction). Section 4(f) does not apply if FHWA, after consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP, determines that the archaeological resource is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery (even if it is agreed not to recover the resource) and has minimal value for preservation in place. For sites discovered during construction, where preservation of the

resource in place is warranted, the Section 4(f) process will be expedited. In such cases, the evaluation of feasible and prudent alternatives will take account of the level of investment already made. The review process, including the consultation with other agencies, should be shortened, as appropriate. An October 19, 1980, memorandum (copy attached) with the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (now National Park Service) provides emergency procedures for unanticipated cultural resources discovered during construction.

Question B:

How should the Section 4(f) requirements be applied to archaeological districts?

Answer B:

Section 4(f) requirements apply to an archaeological district the same as they do to an archaeological site (only where preservation in place is warranted). However, as with historic districts, Section 4(f) would not apply if after consultation with the SHPO, FHWA determines that the project occupies only a part of the district which is a noncontributing part of that district provided such portion could be occupied without adversely affecting the integrity of the archaeological district. In addition, Section 4(f) would not apply if after consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP, it is determined that the project occupies only a part of the district which is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery and has minimal value for preservation in place, provided such portion could be occupied without adversely affecting the integrity of the archaeological district.

6. Public Multiple-use Land Holdings

Question:

Are multiple-use public land holdings (e.g., National Forests, State Forests, Bureau of Land Management lands, etc.) subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer:

Section 4(f) applies to historic sites and only to those portions of lands which are designated by statute or identified in the management plans of the administering agency as being for park, recreation, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge purposes and which are determined to be significant for such purposes. For public land holdings which do not have management plans (or where existing management plans are not current) Section 4(f) applies to those areas which function primarily for Section 4(f) purposes. Section 4(f) does not apply to areas of multiple-use lands which function primarily for purposes not protected by Section 4(f).

7. Late Designation

Question:

Are properties in highway ownership that are designated (as park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites) late in the development of a proposed project subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer:

Except for archaeological resources, a project may proceed without consideration under Section 4(f) if that land was purchased for transportation purposes prior to the designation or prior to a change in the determination of significance and if an adequate effort was made to identify properties protected by Section 4(f) prior to the acquisition. The adequacy of effort made to identify properties protected by Section 4(f) should consider the requirements, or the standards of adequacy, that existed at the time of search. Archaeological resources may be subject to the requirements of Section 4(f) in accordance with Question 5A.

8. Wild and Scenic Rivers

Question A:

Are rivers and adjoining lands under study (pursuant to Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act) as potential wild and scenic rivers subject to Section 4(f)?

Answer A:

No. However, publicly owned public parks, recreation areas, and refuges and historic sites in a potential river corridor would still be subject to Section 4(f).

Question B:

Are rivers which are included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System and the adjoining lands subject to Section 4(f)?

Answer B:

Publicly owned waters of designated wild and scenic rivers are protected by Section 4(f). Publicly owned lands in the immediate proximity of such rivers may be protected by Section 4(f) depending on the manner in which they are administered by the Federal, State, or local government which administers the land. Wild and scenic rivers are managed by different Federal

agencies including the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service. The FHWA should examine the management plan developed for the river (as required by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act) to determine how the public lands adjacent to the rivers are administered. Section 4(f) would apply to those portions of the land designated in the management plan for recreation or other Section 4(f) activities. Where the management plan is not sufficiently specific, FHWA should consult further with the river manager and document the primary function of the area in order to make a Section 4(f) determination. Those areas that function primarily and/or are managed for recreational purposes are subject to Section 4(f).

9. Fairgrounds

Question:

Are publicly owned fairgrounds subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer:

Section 4(f) is not applicable to publicly owned fairgrounds that function primarily for commercial purposes (e.g., stock car races, annual fairs, etc.), rather than recreation. When fairgrounds are open to the public and function primarily for public recreation other than an annual fair, Section 4(f) only applies to those portions of land determined significant for recreational purposes.

10. School Playgrounds

Question:

Are publicly owned school playgrounds subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer:

While the primary purpose of school playgrounds is for structured physical education classes and recreation for students, such lands may also serve public recreational purposes and as such, may be subject to Section 4(f) requirements. When the playground serves only school activities and functions, the playground is not considered subject to Section 4(f). However, when the playground is open to the public and serves either organized or recreational purposes (walk-on activity), it is subject to the requirements of Section 4(f) if the playground is determined to be significant for recreational purposes (see Question 2B). In determining the significance of the playground facilities, there may be more than one official having jurisdiction over the facility. A school official is considered to be the official having jurisdiction of the land during school activities. However, the school board may have authorized the city's park and recreation

department or a public organization to control the facilities after school hours. The actual function of the playground is the determining factor under these circumstances. Therefore, documentation should be obtained from the official(s) having jurisdiction over the facility stating whether or not the playground is of local significance for recreational purposes.

11. Bodies of Water

Question:

How does the Section 4(f) apply to publicly owned lakes and rivers?

Answer:

Lakes are sometimes subject to multiple, even conflicting, activity and do not readily fit into one category or another. When lakes function for park, recreation, or refuge activities, Section 4(f) would only apply to those portions of water which function primarily for those purposes. Section 4(f) does not apply to the areas which function primarily for other purposes. In general, rivers are not subject to the requirements of Section 4(f). Rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System are subject to the requirements of Section 4(f) in accordance with Questions 8A and 8B. Those portions of publicly owned rivers which are designated as recreational trails are subject to the requirements of Section 4(f). Of course, Section 4(f) would also apply to lakes and rivers, or portions thereof, which are contained within the boundaries of parks, recreational areas, refuges, and historic sites to which Section 4(f) otherwise applies.

12. Trails

Question A:

The National Trails System Act permits the designation of scenic and recreational trails. Are these trails or other designated scenic or recreational trails on publicly owned land subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer A:

Yes, except for the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail which was exempted from Section 4(f) by Public Law 95-625.

Question B:

Are trails on privately owned land (including land under public easement) which are designated as scenic or recreational trails subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer B:

Section 4(f) does not apply to trails on privately owned land unless there is a public easement to permit the public to utilize the trail. Nevertheless, every reasonable effort should be made to maintain the continuity of the designated trails in the National System.

Question C:

Are trails on highway rights-of-way which are designated as scenic or recreational trails subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer C:

If the trail is simply described as occupying the rights-of-way of the highway and is not limited to any specific location within the right-of-way, a “use” of land would not occur provided adjustments or changes in the alignment of the highway or the trail would not substantially impair the continuity of the trail. In this regard, it would be helpful if all future designations made under the National Trails System Act describe the location of the trail only as generally in the right-of-way.

Question D:

Are historic trails which are designated (pursuant to the National Trails System Act) as national historic trails (but not scenic or recreational) subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer D:

Only lands or sites adjacent to historic trails which are on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are subject to Section 4(f). Otherwise (pursuant to Public Law 95-625), national historic trails are exempt from Section 4(f).

13. Bikeways

Question:

Do the requirements of Section 4 (f) apply to bikeways?

Answer:

If the bikeway is primarily for transportation and is an integral part of the local transportation system, the requirements of Section 4(f) would not apply. Section 4(f) would apply to bikeways (or portions thereof) designated or functioning primarily for recreation unless the official having jurisdiction determines it is not to be significant for such purpose. However, as with recreational trails, if the recreational bikeway is simply described as occupying the highway rights-of-way and is not limited to any specific location within that right-of-way, a “use” of land would not occur (Section 4(f) would not apply) provided adjustments or changes in the alignment of the highway or bikeway would not substantially impair the continuity of the bikeway.

Regardless of whether Section 4(f) applies to a bikeway, Title 23, Section 109(n), precludes the approval of any project which will result in the severance or destruction of an existing major route for non-motorized transportation traffic unless such project provides a reasonably alternative route or such a route exists.

14. Joint Development (Park with Highway Corridor)

Question:

Where a public park or recreation area is planned on a publicly owned tract of land and a strip of land within the tract is reserved for a highway corridor at the time the development plan for the tract is established, do the requirements of Section 4(f) apply?

Answer:

The requirements of Section 4(f) do not apply to the subsequent highway construction on the reserved right-of-way as previously planned. All measures which were taken to jointly develop the highway and the park should be completely documented in the project records.

15. “Planned” Facilities

Question:

Do the requirements of Section 4(f) apply to publicly owned properties “planned” for park, recreation area, wildlife refuge, or waterfowl refuge purposes even though they are not presently functioning as such?

Answer:

Section 4(f) applies if the agency that owns the property has formally designated and determined it to be significant for park, recreation area, wildlife refuge, or waterfowl purposes.

16. Temporary Occupancy of Highway Right-of-Way

Question:

Is temporary occupancy of highway rights-of-way for park and recreational activity (e.g., a playground or snowmobile trail is allowed to be located on highway property) subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer:

Section 4(f) does not apply to either authorized or unauthorized temporary occupancy of highway right-of-way pending further project development. For authorized temporary occupancy of highway rights-of-way for recreation, it would be advisable to make clear in a limited occupancy permit with a reversionary clause that no right is created and the park or recreational activity is a temporary one pending completion of the highway project.

17. Tunneling

Question:

Is tunneling under a publicly owned public park, recreation area, wildlife refuge, and waterfowl refuge, or historic site subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer:

Section 4(f) would apply only if the tunneling (1) will disturb any archaeological sites on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places which warrant preservation in place, or (2) causes disruption which will harm the purposes for which the park, recreation, wildlife or waterfowl refuge was established or will adversely affect the historic integrity of the historic site.

18. Wildlife Management Areas

Question:

Do the requirements of Section 4(f) apply to Wildlife Management Areas?

Answer:

Section 4(f) may apply to publicly owned wildlife management areas (or any other wildlife area, e.g., Wildlife Reserve, Wildlife Preserve, Wildlife Sanctuary, Waterfowl Production Area, etc.), which are not a wildlife refuge but perform some of the same functions as a refuge. If a Federal, State, or local law clearly delineates a difference between Wildlife Refuges and Wildlife Management Areas, the intentional separation of these systems demonstrates that Section 4(f) should not apply to Wildlife Management Areas in the jurisdiction for which the law governs. If a Federal, State, or local law does not establish such a clear distinction, the property should be examined to determine its “refuge” characteristics. If the wildlife management area primarily functions as a sanctuary or refuge for the protection of species, Section 4(f) would apply.

Publicly owned wildlife management areas (or any other wildlife area, which is not a refuge or sanctuary) may allow recreation opportunities. The areas on which the recreation occurs may be subject to the requirements of Section 4(f) in accordance with Question 6.

19. Air Rights

Question:

Do the requirements of Section 4(f) apply to bridging over a publicly owned public park, recreation area, wildlife refuge, waterfowl refuge, or historic site?

Answer:

Section 4(f) applies if piers or other appurtenances are placed on the park, recreation, wildlife refuge or waterfowl refuge or historic site. Section 4(f) also applies if the bridge harms the purposes for which these lands were established or adversely affects the historic integrity of the historic site.

20. Access Ramps (in accord with Section 147)

Question:

Is the construction of access ramps (pursuant to Section 147 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1976, Public Law 94-280) to public boat launching areas located within a publicly owned public park, recreation area, wildlife refuge, or waterfowl refuge subject to the requirements of Section 4(f)?

Answer:

Section 147 provides for the construction of access ramps to public boat launching areas adjacent to bridges under construction, reconstruction, replacement, repair, or alteration on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban system highways. Such access ramps are not an integral or necessary component of the bridge project (to which they are appended) which is approved by the FHWA nor do such access ramps meet any transportation need or provide any transportation benefits.

Where boat launching areas are located in publicly owned parks, recreational areas, or refuges otherwise protected by the provisions of Section 4(f), it would be contrary to the intent of Section 147 to search for “feasible and prudent alternatives” to the use of such areas as a site for a ramp to a boat launching area. A consistent reading of Section 147 and Section 4(f) precludes the simultaneous application of the two sections to boat launching ramp projects through or to the publicly owned park, recreation area or refuge with which the boat launching area is associated. Therefore, Section 4(f) does not apply to access ramp projects to such boat launching areas carried out pursuant to Section 147. However, the construction, replacement, repair, or alteration of a bridge on Section 4(f) land will be subject to Section 4(f).

21. Scenic Byways

Question:

How does Section 4(f) apply to scenic byways?

Answer:

The designation of a road as a scenic byway is not intended to create a park or recreation area within the meaning of 49 USC 303 or 23 USC 138. The improvement (reconstruction, rehabilitation or relocation) of a publicly-owned scenic byway would not come under the purview of Section 4(f) unless the improvement were to otherwise use land from a protected resource.

22. Temporary Construction Easements

Question:

How does Section 4(f) apply to temporary construction easements?

Answer:

Section 4(f) does not apply to a temporary occupancy (including those resulting from a right-of-entry, construction and other temporary easements and other short-term arrangements) of publicly-owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife or waterfowl refuges, or any historic site where there is documentation that the officials having jurisdiction over the protected resource agree that the temporary occupancy will:

- (a) be of short duration and less than the time needed for construction of the project,
- (b) not change the ownership or result in the retention of long-term or indefinite interests in the land for transportation purposes,
- (c) not result in any temporary or permanent adverse change to the activities, features, or attributes which are important to the purposes or functions that qualify the resource for protection under Section 4(f), and
- (d) include only a minor amount of land.

2 Attachments

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION AND THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND RECREATION SERVICE CONCERNING EMERGENCY PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO UNANTICIPATED CULTURAL RESOURCES DISCOVERED DURING CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

WHEREAS, the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is authorized and directed by Congress to implement the Federal-aid highway program (Title 23, U.S.C.); and

WHEREAS, a delay to the project could unnecessarily disrupt a construction schedule and be costly; and

WHEREAS, representatives of the FHWA, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) have met to consider FHWA responsibilities when such emergency conditions exist; and

WHEREAS, these parties agree that a special procedure is necessary and appropriate to allow expeditious consideration of such resources and meet the requirements of 36 CFR, Part 800.7;

THEREFORE, it is mutually agreed that the stipulations in this Memorandum of Understanding provide an expeditious alternate method for consideration of cultural resources which are discovered after construction has started.

STIPULATIONS

- I. When a Federal-aid highway construction project uncovers a cultural resource that may be eligible for the National Register, the expeditious process detailed in Stipulation II may be adopted if the following has been accomplished:
 - A. A cultural resource survey performed according to the requirements of 36 CFR, Part 800.4(a), was completed prior to project approval and the discovered resource was not identified during such survey.
 - B. The process detailed in the ACHP regulations (36 CFR, Part 800) was completed prior to the start of construction.
 - C. The construction contract directs the contractor to be on the lookout for cultural resources and to avoid damage to such discovered resources until the provisions of Stipulation II are complied with.
- II. Whenever anything that might be a cultural resource is discovered during construction, work will avoid the area of the discovery and the contractor shall notify the State highway agency (SHA) immediately. If warranted, the SHA will contact and inform the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and FHWA of the discovery and arrange an on-site meeting of appropriate parties if either FHWA or the SHPO believes it necessary. If it is determined that a meeting will be held, the following actions will be taken:
 - A. The FHWA will notify the HCRS, Division of Interagency Archeological Services (IAS), Department of the Interior (DOI), by telephone with followup written notification that it appears that significant archeological or historical data contained in a cultural resource have been uncovered on a particular project.

- B. Within 48 hours of telephone notification, HCRS will send an authorized representative of the Secretary of the Interior (DOI representative) to examine the discovery.
- C. Following examination and consultation with the SHPO, SHA, FHWA, and any local authorities deemed appropriate, one of the following recommendations will be made at the on-site meeting by the DOI representative. If the DOI representative does not attend the scheduled field review, FHWA may proceed with what it considers to be an appropriate course of action. The SHA and SHPO representatives may also make one of these recommendations if they so choose.
1. The data discovered are significant and should be preserved in place; or
 2. The data discovered are significant and should be recovered; or
 3. The data discovered are significant but no additional data recovery need be undertaken; or
 4. The data discovered are not significant and no data recovery need be undertaken.
 5. There is insufficient information to determine if the data discovered are significant and the necessary steps to obtain the needed information to reach one of the definite conclusions stated above will be recommended.
- D. In consultation with the DOI representative, the SHPO, SHA, and appropriate local authorities, FHWA will decide the appropriate course of action in proceeding with the project. When data recovery is the appropriate option, the on-site meeting will determine what steps should be taken to recover the significant data, including development of data recovery plan.
- III. This understanding may be terminated by any of the signatories upon a 60-day notification to all other signatories.

Administrator, Federal Highway Administration

September 23, 1980
Date

Director, Heritage Conservation Recreation Service

October 1, 1980
Date

Concurring Party

President, National Conference of State Historic
Preservation Officers

October 28, 1980
Date

Differences Between the FHWA and DOI Positions

Constructive Use

The Department of the Interior (DOI) stated they might consider the following as examples of constructive use: (1) where the proximity of a highway alters a habitat area in a wildlife refuge or interferes with the normal behavior of wildlife populations; (2) where a highway reduces the current level of access to a park or recreation area; and (3) where a highway changes the character of the view from a historic district that is incompatible with the historic nature of the district. The DOI's description of the threshold for constructive use of Section 4(f) resources contains terms such as alters, interferes, reduces and changes. We agree that these types of impacts, where they are sufficiently severe to substantially impair the resource, would be a constructive use. However, standing alone, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) views these terms as establishing a lower threshold than those generally found in case law. A number of court decisions, including Adler v. Lewis, 675 F.2d 1085 (9th Cir. 1982), have established "substantial impairment" as the threshold for constructive use.

Wild and Scenic Rivers — The DOI stated that (1) all rivers now in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System have been designated because of recreational and park (conservation, etc.) values, (2) all publicly-owned lands within those boundaries are used for Section 4(f) purposes, (3) the management plans will show that the primary use is, in accord with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, for one or more Section 4(f) purposes, and (4) the officials having jurisdiction will, in all cases, certify that this is so if asked. The FHWA does not necessarily base application of Section 4(f) on titles or systems designation. Instead, FHWA bases Section 4(f) application on actual function. If portions of the publicly-owned lands are designated for or function primarily for recreational purposes, then those portions would be subject to Section 4(f). We do not believe that publicly-owned lands designated only for conservation values are recreational areas subject to Section 4(f).

Wildlife Management Areas (WMA) — The DOI stated that Federal WMAs are part of the National Wildlife Refuge System and therefore are considered to be a refuge within the meaning of Section 4(f). We have revised the discussion on wildlife management areas to state that such areas would be protected by Section 4(f) where they perform the same functions as a refuge, i.e., protection of species. As explained in answer 2A we would, of course, rely heavily on the views of the officials having jurisdiction over these areas in determining their function.

Historic Sites — The DOI wants to afford Section 4(f) protection to historic sites even if they are not on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Obviously, we cannot afford Section 4(f) protection to every site which is claimed historic by any individual. It has been a longstanding DOT Policy to apply Section 4(f) to all sites on or eligible for the National Register. In addition, the FHWA environmental regulation and this policy paper extend Section 4(f) protection to the historic sites based on an individual site-by-site review.

Archaeological Sites — The DOI wants to afford Section 4(f) protection to archaeological sites even if they are important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery and have minimal value for preservation in place. This position is contrary to our regulation which was upheld in the Belmont case (Town of Belmont v. Dole, 755 F.2d 28 (1st Cir., 1985)).

This Section includes the following documents:

- Page 1 Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges
- Page 6 Final Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for Federally-Aided Highway Projects With Minor Involvements With Public Parks, Recreation Lands, and Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges
- Page 13 Final Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for Federally-Aided Highway Projects With Minor Involvements With Historic Sites
- Page 19 Programmatic Section 4(f) Statement for Independent Bikeway or Walkway Construction Projects

Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges

[As published in the Federal Register / Volume 48, No. 163 / Monday, August 22, 1983.]

This statement sets forth the basis for a programmatic Section 4(f) approval that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of certain historic bridge structures to be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds and that the projects include all possible planning to minimize harm resulting from such use. This approval is made pursuant to Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, 49 U.S.C. 303, and Section 18(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, 23 U.S.C. 138.

Use

The historic bridges covered by this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation are unique because they are historic, yet also part of either a Federal-aid highway system or a State or local highway system that has continued to evolve over the years. Even though these structures are on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places, they must perform as an integral part of a modern transportation system. When they do not or cannot, they must be rehabilitated or replaced in order to assure public safety while maintaining system continuity and integrity. For the purpose of this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation, a proposed action will “use” a bridge that is on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places when the action will impair the historic integrity of the bridge either by rehabilitation or demolition. Rehabilitation that does not impair the historic integrity of the bridge as determined by procedures implementing the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA), is not subject to Section 4(f).

Applicability

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation may be applied by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to projects which meet the following criteria:

1. The bridge is to be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds.
2. The project will require the use of a historic bridge structure which is on or is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

3. The bridge is not a National Historic Landmark.
4. The FHWA Division Administrator determines that the facts of the project match those set forth in the sections of this document labeled as Alternatives, Findings, and Mitigation.
5. Agreement among the FHWA, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has been reached through procedures pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA.

Alternatives

The following alternatives avoid any use of the historic bridge:

1. Do nothing.
2. Build a new structure at a different location without affecting the historic integrity of the old bridge, as determined by procedures implementing the NHPA.
3. Rehabilitate the historic bridge without affecting the historic integrity of the structure, as determined by procedures implementing the NHPA.

This list is intended to be all-inclusive. The programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply if a reasonable alternative is identified that is not discussed in this document. The project record must clearly demonstrate that each of the above alternatives was fully evaluated and that it must further demonstrate that all applicability criteria listed above were met before the FHWA Division Administrator concluded that the programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation applied to the project.

Findings

In order for this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to be applied to a project, each of the following findings must be supported by the circumstances, studies, and consultations on the project:

1. *Do Nothing*. The do nothing alternative has been studied, The do nothing alternative ignores the basic transportation need. For the following reasons, this alternative is not feasible and prudent:

- a. Maintenance—The do nothing alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient or deteriorated. These deficiencies can lead to sudden collapse and potential injury or loss of life. Normal maintenance is not considered adequate to cope with the situation.
 - b. Safety—The do nothing alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered deficient. Because of these deficiencies, the bridge poses serious and unacceptable safety hazards to the traveling public or places intolerable restriction on transport and travel.
2. *Build on New Location Without Using the Old Bridge.* Investigations have been conducted to construct a bridge on new location or parallel to the old bridge (allowing for a one-way couplet), but, for one or more of the following reasons, this alternative is not feasible and prudent:
- a. Terrain—The present bridge structure has already been located at the only feasible and prudent site, i.e., a gap in the land form, the narrowest point of the river canyon, etc. To build a new bridge at another site will result in extraordinary bridge and approach engineering and construction difficulty or costs or extraordinary disruption to established traffic patterns.
 - b. Adverse Social, Economic, or Environmental Effects—Building a new bridge away from the present site would result in social, economic, or environmental impact of extraordinary magnitude. Such impacts as extensive severing of productive farmlands, displacement of a significant number of families or businesses, serious disruption of established travel patterns, and access and damage to wetlands may individually or cumulatively weigh heavily against relocation to a new site.
 - c. Engineering and Economy—Where difficulty associated with the new location is less extreme than those encountered above, a new site would not be feasible and prudent where cost and engineering difficulties reach extraordinary magnitude. Factors supporting this conclusion include significantly increased roadway and structure costs, serious foundation problems, or extreme difficulty in reaching the new site with construction equipment. Additional design and safety factors to be considered include an ability to achieve minimum design standards or to meet requirements of various permitting agencies such as those involved with navigation, pollution, and the environment.
 - d. Preservation of Old Bridge—It is not feasible and prudent to preserve the existing bridge, even if a new bridge were to be built at a new location. This

could occur when the historic bridge is beyond rehabilitation for a transportation or an alternative use, when no responsible party can be located to maintain and preserve the bridge, or when a permitting authority, such as the Coast Guard requires removal or demolition of the old bridge.

3. *Rehabilitation Without Affecting the Historic Integrity of the Bridge.* Studies have been conducted of rehabilitation measures, but, for one or more of the following reasons, this alternative is not feasible and prudent:
 - a. The bridge is so structurally deficient that it cannot be rehabilitated to meet minimum acceptable load requirements without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge.
 - b. The bridge is seriously deficient geometrically and cannot be widened to meet the minimum required capacity of the highway system on which it is located without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge. Flexibility in the application of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials geometric standards should be exercised as permitted in 23 CFR Part 625 during the analysis of this alternative.

Measures to Minimize Harm

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation and approval may be used only for projects where the FHWA Division Administrator, in accordance with this evaluation, ensures that the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm. This has occurred when:

1. For bridges that are to be rehabilitated, the historic integrity of the bridge is preserved, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with unavoidable transportation needs, safety, and load requirements;
2. For bridges that are to be rehabilitated to the point that the historic integrity is affected or that are to be moved or demolished, the FHWA ensures that, in accordance with the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards, or other suitable means developed through consultation, fully adequate records are made of the bridge;
3. For bridges that are to be replaced, the existing bridge is made available for an alternative use, provided a responsible party agrees to maintain and preserve the bridge; and
4. For bridges that are adversely affected, agreement among the SHPO, ACHP, and FHWA is reached through the Section 106 process of the NHPA on measures to minimize harm

and those measures are incorporated into the project. This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply to projects where such an agreement cannot be reached.

Procedures

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation applies only when the FHWA Division Administrator:

1. Determines that the project meets the applicability criteria set forth above;
2. Determines that all of the alternatives set forth in the Findings section have been fully evaluated;
3. Determines that use of the findings in this document that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the historic bridge is clearly applicable;
4. Determines that the project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm section of this document;
5. Assures that implementation of the measures to minimize harm is completed; and
6. Documents the project file that the programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation applies to the project on which it is to be used.

Coordination

Pursuant to Section 4(f), this statement has been coordinated with the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Housing and Urban Development.

Issued on July 5, 1983.

Ali F. Sevin

*Director, Office of Environmental Policy,
Federal Highway Administration*

**Final Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for
Federally-Aided Highway Projects With Minor Involvements
With Public Parks, Recreation Lands, and
Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges**

[As published in the Federal Register / Volume 52, No. 160 / Wednesday, August 19, 1987.]

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation has been prepared for projects which improve existing highways and use minor amounts of publicly owned public parks, recreations lands, or wildlife and waterfowl refuges that are adjacent to existing highways. This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation satisfies the requirements of Section 4(f) for all projects that meet the applicability criteria listed below. No individual Section 4(f) evaluations need be prepared for such projects.

[Note: A similar programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation has been prepared for projects which use minor amounts of land from historic sites.]

The FHWA Division Administrator is responsible for reviewing each individual project to determine that it meets the criteria and procedures of this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation. The Division Administrator's determinations will be thorough and will clearly document the items that have been reviewed. The written analysis and determinations will be combined in a single document and placed in the project record and will be made available to the public upon request. This programmatic evaluation will not change the existing procedures for project compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or with public involvement requirements.

Applicability

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation may be applied by FHWA only to projects meeting the following criteria:

1. The proposed project is designed to improve the operational characteristics, safety, and/or physical condition of existing highway facilities on essentially the same alignment. This includes "4R" work (resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction); safety improvements, such as shoulder widening and the correction of substandard curves and intersections; traffic operation improvements, such as signalization, channelization, and turning or climbing lanes; bicycle and pedestrian facilities; bridge replacements on essentially the same alignment; and the construction of additional lanes. This

programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply to the construction of a highway on a new location.

2. The Section 4(f) lands are publicly owned public parks, recreation lands, or wildlife and waterfowl refuges located adjacent to the existing highway.
3. The amount and location of the land to be used shall not impair the use of the remaining Section 4(f) land, in whole or in part, for its intended purpose. This determination is to be made by the FHWA in concurrence with the officials having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) lands, and will be documented in relation to the size, use, and/or other characteristics deemed relevant.

The total amount of land to be acquired from any Section 4(f) site shall not exceed the values in the following Table:

Total size of section 4(f) site	Maximum to be acquired
<10 acres	10 percent of site
10 acres – 100 acres	1 acre
>100 acres	1 percent of site

4. The proximity impacts of the project on the remaining Section 4(f) land shall not impair the use of such land for its intended purpose. This determination is to be made by the FHWA in concurrence with the officials having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) lands, and will be documented with regard to noise, air, and water pollution, wildlife and habitat effects, aesthetic values, and/or other impacts deemed relevant.
5. The officials having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) lands must agree, in writing, with the assessment of the impacts of the proposed project on, and the proposed mitigation for, the Section 4(f) lands.
6. For projects using land from a site purchased or improved with funds under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act (Dingell-Johnson Act), the Federal Aid in Wildlife Act (Pittman-Robertson Act), or similar laws, or the lands are otherwise encumbered with a Federal interest (e.g., former Federal surplus property), coordination with the appropriate Federal agency is required to ascertain the agency's position on the land conversion or transfer. The programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply if the agency objects to the land conversion or transfer.
7. This programmatic evaluation does not apply to projects for which an environmental impact statement (EIS) is prepared, unless the use of Section 4(f) lands is discovered after

the approval of the final EIS. Should any of the above criteria not be met, this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation cannot be used, and an individual Section 4(f) evaluation must be prepared.

Alternatives

The following alternatives avoid any use of the public park land, recreational area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge:

1. Do nothing.
2. Improve the highway without using the adjacent public park recreational land, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge.
3. Build an improved facility on new location without using the public park, recreation land, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge.

This list is intended to be all-inclusive. The programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply if a feasible and prudent alternative is identified that is not discussed in this document. The project record must clearly demonstrate that each of the above alternatives was fully evaluated before the FHWA Division Administrator concluded that the programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation applied to the project.

Findings

In order for this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to be applied to a project, each of the following findings must be supported by the circumstances, studies, and consultations on the project:

1. *Do Nothing Alternative.* The Do Nothing Alternative is not feasible and prudent because:
 - a. It would not correct existing or projected capacity deficiencies; or
 - b. It would not correct existing safety hazards; or
 - c. It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems;
and

- d. Not providing such correction would constitute a cost or community impact of extraordinary magnitude, or would result in truly unusual or unique problems, when compared with the proposed use of the Section 4(f) lands.
2. *Improvement Without Using the Adjacent Section 4(f) Lands.* It is not feasible and prudent to avoid Section 4(f) lands by roadway design or transportation system management techniques (including, but not limited to, minor alignment shifts, changes in geometric design standards, use of retaining walls and/or other structures, and traffic diversions or other traffic management measures) because implementing such measures would result in:
- a. Substantial adverse community impacts to adjacent homes, businesses, or other improved properties; or
 - b. Substantially increased roadway or structure cost; or
 - c. Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems; or
 - d. Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts; or
 - e. The project not meeting identified transportation needs; and
 - f. The impacts, costs, or problems would be truly unusual or unique, or of extraordinary magnitude when compared with the proposed use of Section 4(f) lands. Flexibility in the application of American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) geometric standards should be exercised, as permitted in 23 CFR Part 625, during the analysis of this alternative.
3. *Alternatives on New Location.* It is not feasible and prudent to avoid Section 4(f) lands by constructing on new alignment because:
- a. The new location would not solve existing transportation, safety, or maintenance problems; or
 - b. The new location would result in substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts (including such impacts as extensive severing of productive farmlands, displacement of a substantial number of families or businesses, serious disruption of established travel patterns, substantial damage to wetlands or other sensitive natural areas, or greater impacts to other Section 4(f) lands); or

- c. The new location would substantially increase costs or engineering difficulties (such as an inability to achieve minimum design standards, or to meet the requirements of various permitting agencies such as those involved with navigation, pollution, and the environment); and
- d. Such problems, impacts, costs, or difficulties would be truly unusual or unique, or of extraordinary magnitude when compared with the proposed use of Section 4(f) lands. Flexibility in the application of AASHTO geometric standards should be exercised, as permitted in 23 CFR Part 625, during the analysis of this alternative.

Measures to Minimize Harm

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation and approval may be used only for projects where the FHWA Division Administrator, in accordance with this evaluation, ensures that the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm. This has occurred when the officials having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property have agreed, in writing, with the assessment of impacts resulting from the use of the Section 4(f) property and with the mitigation measures to be provided. Mitigation measures shall include one or more of the following:

1. Replacement of lands used with lands of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location and of at least comparable value.
2. Replacement of facilities impacted by the project including sidewalks, paths, benches, lights, trees, and other facilities.
3. Restoration and landscaping of disturbed areas.
4. Incorporation of design features (e.g., reduction in right-of-way width, modifications to the roadway section, retaining walls, curb and gutter sections, and minor alignment shifts); and habitat features (e.g., construction of new, or enhancement of existing wetlands or other special habitat types); where necessary to reduce or minimize impacts to the Section 4(f) property. Such features should be designed in a manner that will not adversely affect the safety of the highway facility. Flexibility in the application of AASHTO geometric standards should be exercised, as permitted in 23 CFR Part 625, during such design.
5. Payment of the fair market value of the land and improvements taken or improvements to the remaining Section 4(f) site equal to the fair market value of the land and improvements taken.

6. Such additional or alternative mitigation measures as may be determined necessary based on consultation with the officials having jurisdiction over the parkland, recreation area, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge.

If the project uses Section 4(f) lands that are encumbered with a Federal interest (see *Applicability*), coordination is required with the appropriate agency to ascertain what special measures to minimize harm, or other requirements, may be necessary under that agency's regulations. To the extent possible, commitments to accomplish such special measures and/or requirements shall be included in the project record.

Coordination

Each project will require coordination in the early stages of project development with the Federal, State, and/or local agency officials having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) lands. In the case of non-Federal Section 4(f) lands, the official with jurisdiction will be asked to identify any Federal encumbrances. Where such encumbrances exist, coordination will be required with the Federal agency responsible for the encumbrance.

For the interests of the Department of Interior, Federal agency coordination will be initiated with the Regional Directors of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation; the State Directors of the Bureau of Land Management; and the Area Directors of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the case of Indian lands, there will also be coordination with appropriate Indian Tribal officials.

Before applying this programmatic evaluation to projects requiring an individual bridge permit, the Division Administrator shall coordinate with the U.S. Coast Guard District Commander.

Copies of the final written analysis and determinations required under this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation shall be provided to the officials having jurisdiction over the involved Section 4(f) area and to other parties upon request.

Approval Procedures

This programmatic Section 4(f) approval applies only after the FHWA Division Administrator has:

1. Determined that the project meets the applicability criteria set forth above;

2. Determined that all of the alternatives set forth in the Findings section have been fully evaluated;
3. Determined that the findings in this document (which conclude that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the publicly owned public park, recreation area, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge) are clearly applicable to the project;
4. Determined that the project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm section of this document;
5. Determined that the coordination called for in this programmatic evaluation has been successfully completed;
6. Assured that the measures to minimize harm will be incorporated in the project; and
7. Documented the project file clearly identifying the basis for the above determinations and assurances.

Issued on December 23, 1986.

Ali F. Sevin

*Director, Office of Environmental Policy,
Federal Highway Administration*

Final Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for Federally-Aided Highway Projects With Minor Involvements With Historic Sites

[As published in the Federal Register / Volume 52, No. 160 / Wednesday, August 19, 1987.]

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation has been prepared for projects which improve existing highways and use minor amounts of land (including non-historic improvements thereon) from historic sites that are adjacent to existing highways. This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation satisfies the requirements of Section 4(f) for all projects that meet the applicability criteria listed below. No individual Section 4(f) evaluations need be prepared for such projects.

[Note: A similar programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation has been prepared for projects which use minor amounts of publicly owned parks, recreation lands, or wildlife and waterfowl refuges.]

The FHWA Division Administrator is responsible for reviewing each individual project to determine that it meets the criteria and procedures of this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation. The Division Administrator's determination will be thorough and will clearly document the items that have been reviewed. The written analysis and determinations will be combined in a single document and placed in the project record and will be made available to the public upon request. This programmatic evaluation will not change the existing procedures for project compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or with public involvement requirements.

Applicability

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation may be applied by FHWA to projects meeting the following criteria:

1. The proposed project is designed to improve the operational characteristics, safety, and/or physical condition of existing highway facilities on essentially the same alignment. This includes "4R" work (resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction); safety improvements, such as shoulder widening and the correction of substandard curves and intersections; traffic operation improvements, such as signalization, channelization, and turning or climbing lanes; bicycle and pedestrian facilities; bridge replacements on essentially the same alignment; and the construction of additional lanes. This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply to the construction of a highway on new location.

2. The historic site involved is located adjacent to the existing highway.
3. The project does not require the removal or alteration of historic buildings, structures, or objects on the historic site.
4. The project does not require the disturbance or removal of archaeological resources that are important to preserve in place rather than to recover for archaeological research. The determination of the importance to preserve in place will be based on consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and, if appropriate, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).
5. The impact on the Section 4(f) site resulting from the use of the land must be considered minor. The word minor is narrowly defined as having either a “no effect” or “no adverse effect” (when applying the requirements of section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR Part 800) on the qualities which qualified the site for listing or eligibility on the National Register of Historic Places. The ACHP must not object to the determination of “no adverse effect.”
6. The SHPO must agree, in writing, with the assessment of the impacts of the proposed project on and the proposed mitigation for the historic sites.
7. This programmatic evaluation does not apply to projects for which an environmental impact statement (EIS) is prepared, unless the use of Section 4(f) lands is discovered after the approval of the final EIS.

Should any of the above criteria not be met, this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation cannot be used, and an individual Section 4(f) evaluation must be prepared.

Alternatives

The following alternatives avoid any use of the historic site.

1. Do nothing.
2. Improve the highway without using the adjacent historic site.
3. Build an improved facility on new location without using the historic site.

This list is intended to be all-inclusive. The programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply if a feasible and prudent alternative is identified that is not discussed in this document. The project record must clearly demonstrate that each of the above alternatives was fully evaluated before the FHWA Division Administrator concluded that the programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation applied to the project.

Findings

In order for this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to be applied to a project, each of the following findings must be supported by the circumstances, studies, and consultations on the project:

1. *Do Nothing Alternative.* The Do Nothing Alternative is not feasible and prudent because:
 - a. It would not correct existing or projected capacity deficiencies; or
 - b. It would not correct existing safety hazards; or
 - c. It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems; and
 - d. Not providing such correction would constitute a cost or community impact of extraordinary magnitude, or would result in truly unusual or unique problems, when compared with the proposed use of the Section 4(f) lands.
2. *Improvement Without Using the Adjacent Section 4(f) Lands.* It is not feasible and prudent to avoid Section 4(f) lands by roadway design or transportation system management techniques (including, but not limited to, minor alignment shifts, changes in geometric design standards, use of retaining walls and/or other structures, and traffic diversions or other traffic management measures) because implementing such measures would result in:
 - a. Substantial adverse community impacts to adjacent homes, businesses or other improved properties; or
 - b. Substantially increased roadway or structure cost; or
 - c. Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems; or
 - d. Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts; or

- e. The project not meeting identified transportation needs; and
 - f. The impacts, costs, or problems would be truly unusual or unique, or of extraordinary magnitude when compared with the proposed use of Section 4(f) lands. Flexibility in the application of American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) geometric standards should be exercised, as permitted in 23 CFR Part 625, during the analysis of this alternative.
3. *Alternatives on New Location.* It is not feasible and prudent to avoid Section 4(f) lands by constructing on new alignment because:
- a. The new location would not solve existing transportation, safety, or maintenance problems, or
 - b. The new location would result in substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts (including such impacts as extensive severing of productive farmlands, displacement of a substantial number of families or businesses, serious disruption of established travel patterns, substantial damage to wetlands or other sensitive natural areas, or greater impacts to other Section 4(f) lands); or
 - c. The new location would substantially increase costs or engineering difficulties (such as an inability to achieve minimum design standards, or to meet the requirements of various permitting agencies such as those involved with navigation, pollution, and the environment); and
 - d. Such problems, impacts, costs, or difficulties would be truly unusual or unique, or of extraordinary magnitude when compared with the proposed use of Section 4(f) lands. Flexibility in the application of AASHTO geometric standards should be exercised, as permitted in 23 CFR Part 625, during the analysis of this alternative.

Measures to Minimize Harm

This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation and approval may be used only for projects where the FHWA Division Administrator, in accordance with this evaluation, ensures that the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm. Measures to minimize harm will consist of those measures necessary to preserve the historic integrity of the site and agreed to, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800 by the FHWA, the SHPO, and, as appropriate, the ACHP.

Coordination

The use of this programmatic evaluation and approval is conditioned upon the satisfactory completion of coordination with the SHPO, the ACHP, and interested persons as called for in 36 CFR Part 800. Coordination with interested persons, such as the local government, the property owner, a local historical society, or an Indian tribe, can facilitate in the evaluation of the historic resource values and mitigation proposals and is therefore highly encouraged.

For historic sites encumbered with Federal interests, coordination is required with the Federal agencies responsible for the encumbrances.

Before applying this programmatic evaluation to projects requiring an individual bridge permit, the Division Administrator shall coordinate with the U.S. Coast Guard District Commander.

Approval Procedure

This programmatic Section 4(f) approval applies only after the FHWA Division Administrator has:

1. Determined that the project meets the applicability criteria set forth above;
2. Determined that all of the alternatives set forth in the Findings section have been fully evaluated;
3. Determined that the findings in this document (which conclude that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of land from or non-historic improvements on the historic site) are clearly applicable to the project;
4. Determined that the project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm section of this document;
5. Determined that the coordination called for in this programmatic evaluation has been successfully completed;
6. Assured that the measures to minimize harm will be incorporated in the project; and
7. Documented the project file clearly identifying the basis for the above determinations and assurances.

Issued on December 23, 1986.

Ali F. Sevin

*Director, Office of Environmental Policy,
Federal Highway Administration*

Programmatic Section 4(f) Statement for Independent Bikeway or Walkway Construction Projects

The following pages include the 1977 “Final Negative Declaration/Section 4(f) Statement and Determination for Independent Bikeway or Walkway Construction Projects” and copies of correspondence from the FHWA advising that the Section 4(f) Statement and Determination remains valid. The FHWA correspondence confirms that the programmatic statement may be used, as appropriate, for bikeway and walkway projects financed with transportation enhancement funds.

As indicated in the July 9, 1992 memorandum from FHWA headquarters, where out of date terms and references are used in the programmatic Section 4(f) Statement (e.g., negative declaration, FHPM, references to FHWA offices), current terminology should be substituted when using the programmatic Section 4(f) Statement.

As indicated in the “Application” section on page 2 of the Programmatic Section 4(f) Statement, it is only applicable to independent bikeway or walkway construction projects and its use is subject to the following constraints:

1. It is applicable only to the use of recreation and park areas established and maintained primarily for active recreation, open space, and similar purposes.
2. It is applicable only when the official having specific jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property has given approval in writing that the project is acceptable and consistent with the designated use of the property and that all possible planning to minimize harm has been accomplished in the location and design of the bikeway or walkway facility.
3. The document does not apply if the project would require the use of critical habitat of endangered species.
4. It does not apply to the use of any land from a publicly owned wildlife or waterfowl refuge or any land from a historic site of national, State, or local significance.
5. It does not apply to projects where there are unusual circumstances (major impacts, adverse effects, or controversy).

To obtain approval under the programmatic Section 4(f) Statement, conformance with each of the above constraints must be documented to the satisfaction of the FHWA. If the applicability criteria cannot be satisfied for an independent bikeway or walkway project involving use of

Section 4(f) land, processing with a separate Section 4(f) evaluation or under another programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation, when applicable, will be required.



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Highway
Administration**

Memorandum

Subject: Programmatic Section 4(f) Statement for
Independent Bikeway or Walkway Construction
Projects

From: Eugene W. Cleckley
Chief, Environmental Operations Division

To: Regional Federal Highway Administrators
Federal Lands Highway Program Administrator

Date:

Reply to
Attn. of:

HEP-3

DA:	
ADA:	
ADM:	
ROW:	
S & E:	
BR:	
PD:	
IMPL:	
MCS:	
LIB:	
IDOT:	

Attached is a copy of the May 23, 1977 memorandum signed by former FHWA Executive Director L.P. Lamm, which transmitted the subject Section 4(f) statement to your office. In an effort to speed up the processing of environmental documentation for the transportation enhancement projects contained in ISTEA, this office has been re-examining all of our policy and guidance material. Based on discussions with our Environmental and Right of Way Law Branch, the subject document is still valid. It should be noted that there are terms and references used in the document which are out of date, such as negative declaration, FHPM, and FHWA office names. However, these are all minor items and do not affect the thought process used in the development of the programmatic document. Where these terms are used, simply substitute the current terminology, such as CE or EA/FONSI for negative declaration, Project Development Branch for Environmental Review Branch, etc. We believe this document combined with the bicycle and pedestrian facilities CE contained in 23 CFR 771.117(c) can greatly reduce the time required to process these types of enhancement projects.

Should you have any questions concerning the document and its use, please contact any of the Project Development Specialist in my office.

Kenneth A. Perret
Kenneth A. Perret

1st Endorsement

July 14, 1992

Fr: Director
Ofc. of Planning & Program Development
Homewood, Illinois

HPP-05

To: Division Administrators - Illinois, Indiana,
Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin

The subject programmatic Section 4(f) is being recirculated for your information and appropriate use.

Ennis V. Heathcock

Paul D. Quinn
By: Paul D. Quinn
Regional Environmental Specialist

Attachment

Memorandum

DATE May 23, 1977

SUBJECT: Negative Declaration/Section 4(f) Statement
for Independent Bikeway or Walkway Construction
Projects

In reply
refer to HEV-11RECEIVED
REG. 4 F.H.W.A.

FROM : Federal Highway Administrator

MAY 31 1977

TO : Regional Federal Highway Administrators
Regions 1-10, and
Regional Engineer, Region 15

In order to reduce processing time and delays, we have prepared a negative declaration/Section 4(f) statement and determination (copy attached) to cover those independent bikeway and pedestrian walkway projects (FHFM 6-1-1-1) which require the use of recreation and park areas. This approved document should be distributed to Division Offices and State highway agencies for their use.

A draft of the negative declaration/Section 4(f) statement was published in the Federal Register (42 F.R. 15394) on March 21, 1977, inviting interested persons to comment. No major adverse comments were received during this commenting period. The majority of letters received were favorable and recommended approval of the document.

This environmental document will not relieve the Division Administrator from reviewing the impacts, mitigation measures, location, and design of individual bikeways. If there are any unusual circumstances (major impacts or controversy), a separate Section 4(f) statement and environmental document (EIS or negative declaration) should be considered for the individual project. It is likely that most projects which do not involve Section 4(f) properties would be nonmajor actions and would not require a formal environmental document.

It is also important to obtain approval from the official having specific jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property that the project is acceptable and consistent with the designated use of the property, and that the location and design have been accomplished in a manner that will not cause harm to the property. A copy of the negative declaration/Section 4(f) statement, along with the approval letter from the official, should be placed in the individual project file.

If you have any question concerning the subject document, please contact the Environmental Review Branch, (202) 426-0106, in the Office of Environmental Policy.


W. M. Cox

For William M. Cox

Final Negative Declaration/Section 4(f) Statement
and Determination for Independent Bikeway
or Walkway Construction Projects

Background

There is a growing interest in bicycling and walking for commuting, for recreation, and for other trip purposes. Where this activity occurs on high-speed roadways, both safety and efficiency can be impaired because of the mixture of motorized and non-motorized modes of travel. Construction of bikeways or pedestrian walkways can promote safety and will assist in retaining the motor vehicle carrying capacity of the highway while enhancing bicycle capacity.

The United States Congress recognized the importance of bicycle and pedestrian travel by including special provisions for these modes in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, Public Law 93-87. Section 124 of this Act (amended Title 23, U.S. Code, by adding Section 217) contained the following principal provisions:

- (1) Federal funds available for the construction of preferential facilities to serve pedestrians and bicyclists are those apportioned in accordance with paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (6) of Section 104(b), 23 U.S.C., and those authorized for Forest highways, Forest development roads and trails, public land development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian reservation roads, and public land highways.
- (2) Not more than \$40 million (amended to \$45 million by Section 134 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1976) apportioned in any fiscal year for purposes described in the preceding paragraph may be obligated for bicycle projects and pedestrian walkways.
- (3) No State shall obligate more than \$2 million (amended to \$2.5 million by Section 134 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1976) of Federal-aid funds for such projects in any fiscal year.
- (4) Such projects shall be located and designed pursuant to an overall plan which will provide due consideration for safety and contiguous routes.

The funding limitations described in (2) and (3) above are applicable only to independent bikeway and walkway construction projects.

Project Description

Independent bikeway or walkway construction projects are those highway construction projects which provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities in contrast to a project whose primary purpose is to serve motorized vehicles. The requirements for qualification of proposed bikeway or walkway facilities as independent bikeway or walkway construction projects are contained in Volume 6, Chapter 1, Section 1, Subsection 1, of the Federal-Aid Highway Program Manual, codified as Part 652 of Chapter 1 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

The bikeways and walkways will be designed and constructed in a manner suitable to the site conditions and the anticipated extent of usage. In general, a bikeway will be designed with an alignment and profile suitable for bicycle use with a surface that will be reasonably durable that incorporates drainage as necessary, and that is of a width appropriate for the planned one-way or two-way use.

The facilities will be accessible to the users or will form a segment located and designed pursuant to an overall plan.

Projects may include the acquisition of land outside the right-of-way, provided the facility will accommodate traffic which would have normally used a Federal-aid highway route, disregarding any legal prohibitions on the use of the route by cyclists or pedestrians.

It is required that a public agency be responsible for maintenance of the federally funded bikeway or walkway. No motorized vehicles will be permitted on the facilities except those for maintenance purposes and snowmobiles where State or local regulations permit.

Application

This negative declaration/preliminary Section 4(f) document is only applicable for independent bikeway or walkway construction projects which require the use of recreation and park areas established and maintained primarily for active recreation, open space, and similar purposes. Additionally, this document is applicable only when the official having specific jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property has given his approval in writing that the project is acceptable and consistent with the designated use of the property and that all possible planning to minimize harm has been accomplished in the location and design of the bikeway or walkway facility. This document does not apply if the project would require the use of critical habitat of endangered species.

This document does not cover the use of any land from a publicly owned wildlife or waterfowl refuge or any land from a historic site of national, State, or local significance. It also does not cover those projects where there are unusual circumstances (major impacts, adverse effects, or controversy). A separate Section 4(f) statement and environmental document must be prepared in these categories.

This document does not cover bicycle or pedestrian facilities that are incidental items of construction in conjunction with highway improvements having the primary purpose of serving motor vehicular traffic.

Summary

The primary purpose for the development of independent bikeway and walkway projects is to provide a facility for traffic which would have normally used a Federal-aid highway route. In some cases, the bikeway and walkway projects can serve a dual function by also providing for recreational use. Where this situation occurs, artificially routing a bikeway or walkway around a compatible park area is not a prudent alternative because it would decrease the recreational value of the bikeway or walkway.

The written approval of the official having specific jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property and construction authorization by FHWA will confirm that all possible planning to minimize harm has been accomplished in the location and design of the bikeway or walkway facility.

Noise and air quality will not be affected by bicycles. There would be increase in the noise level if snowmobiles are permitted. However, this would likely occur at a time when other uses of the recreational facilities will be minimal.

Temporary impacts on water quality will be minimal. Erosion control measures will be used through the construction period. A certain amount of land will be removed from other uses. The type of land and uses will vary from project to project. However, due to the narrow cross-section of the bikeways and walkways, a minimal amount of land will be required for the individual projects. The projects will be blended into existing terrain to reduce any visual impacts.

Displacement of families and businesses will not be required.

No significant adverse social or economic impacts are anticipated. There will be beneficial impacts such as the enhancement of the recreational potential of the parks and the provision of an alternate mode of transportation for the commuter.

Comments and Coordination

A draft of this negative declaration/Section 4(f) statement was published in the Federal Register (42 F.R. 15394) March 21, 1977, inviting interested persons to comment. The majority of the letters received were favorable and recommended approval of the document.

The document was also circulated to the Departments of the Interior (DOI), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and Agriculture. Comments were received from DOI and HUD and are included in the appendix along with our responses.

Individual projects will be coordinated at the earliest feasible time with all responsible local officials, including the State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officer. The use of properties acquired or developed with Federal monies from the Land and Water Conservation Fund will also be coordinated with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of DOI.

If HUD Community Development Block Grant Funds are used in conjunction with Federal Highway Administration Funds, HUD environmental review procedures set forth in 24 CFR, Section 58, are applicable.

Determination

Based on the above and on the scope of these bikeway and walkway projects, it is determined that they will not have a significant effect upon the quality of the human environment. It is also our determination that (1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of Section 4(f) lands, and (2) the conditions for approval will insure that the bikeway proposals will include all possible planning to minimize harm resulting from such use.

May 23, 1977

DATE

[Original signed by L.P. Lamm]

For William M. Cox
Federal Highway Administrator

APPENDIX



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

In reply refer to:
(ER-77/105)

MAR 21 1977

Dear Mr. Lash:

This is in response to your February, 1977 request for the Department of the Interior's comments on the proposed Negative Declaration/Section 4(f) statement for Independent Bikeway or Walkway Construction Projects.

We are pleased that the proposed document responds to a number of the comments made in our letter of June 25, 1976, on the Bikeway Demonstration Program. We note that the present document is not applicable to the use of land from a publicly owned wildlife or waterfowl refuge or any land from a historic site, nor is it applicable if the project would require the use of critical habitat of endangered species. We note further that the document applies only to the use of recreation and park areas established and maintained primarily for active recreation, open space, and similar purposes.

We concur with these limitations on the application of the proposed Negative Declaration/Section 4(f) statement. However, we wish to again express our opinion that the proposed document not be applicable to:

(1)

1. Significant wetlands;
2. Unique ecological areas set aside for the preservation, interpretation, or scientific study of plant and animal communities, e.g., Registered Natural Landmarks and Registered Environmental Education Landmarks.



3. Play areas for small children (tot lots, etc.,); and
4. Small park areas where the bikeway or walkway may use a significant portion of the available space (vest-pocket parks, etc.,).

We are also pleased that the document makes provision for early coordination with all responsible local officials, including the State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officer, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) when Land and Water Conservation Fund grants are involved. We suggest, however, that you may wish to coordinate all projects of this type with the appropriate Regional Office of BOR for the technical assistance they can provide on bikeways and walkways. (2)

According to our calculations, a funding level of \$45,000,000 for these bikeways and walkways would amount to somewhere between 1,800 and 4,500 miles of trail per year. This would directly remove from all other use (including use by flora and fauna) roughly 1,000 to 6,800 acres per year. This impact should be addressed in the proposed negative declaration. (3)

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposed document.

Sincerely yours,



Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior

Mr. Michael Lash
Director of Environmental Policy
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Washington, D. C. 20590

Responses to the Department of the Interior
Letter of March 21, 1977

- (1) We believe the Application section is adequate to cover those cases where there are unusual circumstances such as major impacts or adverse effects. The key point is that the official having specific jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property has to agree that the project is acceptable and consistent with the designated use of the property, and that the location and design have been accomplished in a manner that will not cause harm to the property.
- (2) The FHWA Division Administrator and the local officials will have the option of requesting additional coordination with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation on all bikeway and walkway projects.
- (3) The use of land for the bikeways and walkways has been addressed in the Summary section. However, it should be understood that this document is for individual projects and was not prepared to address the impacts of the entire bikeway program.



DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

FEB 15 1977

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

IN REPLY REFER TO:
CSR

Your reference:
HEV-11

Mr. Michael Lash
Director of
Environmental Policy
Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Nassif Building - Room 3234
Washington, D. C. 20590

Dear Mr. Lash: *for Ke*

Thank you for providing this Office with the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed draft negative declaration/Section 4(f) for the construction of independent bikeways and pedestrian walkways. While your negative declaration proposal will reduce processing time, we propose for your consideration the following recommendations:

1. Under the caption Application insert the following before the last sentence in the first paragraph:
The project must be in accord with a unified and officially coordinated program for the development of open space land as part of local and areawide comprehensive planning. (1)
2. Under the caption Application add the following to the second paragraph: If unusual natural or man-made conditions exist in the proposed project area which might be deleteriously affected by the proposed bikeway or pedestrian walkway, then a Section 4(f) and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared for the project. (2)

2

3. Under the caption Coordination, second paragraph add the following: If HUD Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds are used by applicants in conjunction with Section 124 funds, HUD environmental review procedures set forth in 24 CFR Section 58 are applicable. (Copy attached) The CDBG program permits the use of funds for the construction of certain public works in conjunction with recreational purposes.

(3)

Sincerely yours,



Richard H. Broun
Director, Office of
Environmental Quality

Attachment

Responses to the Department of Housing
and Urban Development Letter of
February 15, 1977

- (1) We do not believe it is necessary to add this sentence to the Application section since this is already a Federal-aid qualification requirement. (See 23 CFR, Part 652.)
- (2) This provision has been added to the Application section.
- (3) The Coordination section has been expanded to include this situation.